

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

FOR

SEPTEMBER AND DECEMBER, 1815:

VOL. XII.

"Ω φίλος, εἰ σοφὸς εἶ, λάβε μ' ὃς χέρας" εἰ δὲ γε πάμπται
Νῆσις ἔφυς Μουσέων, ρίψον ἀ μὴ νοέσις.

EPIC. INCERT.



London:

PRINTED BY A. J. VALPY,
TOOKS COURT, CHANCERY LANE;

SOLD BY

LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN; RICHARDSON,
SHERWOOD, NEELY, AND JONES, PATERNOSTER ROW;
UNDERWOOD, FLEET-STREET; PARKER, OX-
FORD; DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE; MACRE-
DIE AND CO. EDINBURGH; AND
ALL OTHER BOOKSELLERS.

1815.

*The copies to be printed will be limited to the number
of Subscribers*

FOR THE NEW AND IMPROVED EDITION

or

Stephens' Greek Thesaurus.

To be edited by A. J. VALPY, A. M. late Fellow of Pemb. College, Oxford; and Mr. E. H. BARKER, of Trin. College, Cambridge.

To be printed at Mr. A. J. Valpy's Press, London.

The work will be published in Parts, at 1*l.* 1*s.* each—
large paper 2*l.* 2*s.* each. To be completed in 3 years.
It is expected that the Work will be comprised in 24 Nos.

Persons desirous of Subscribing are respectfully requested to send their names to Mr A. J. Valpy, Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane; and to appoint a Correspondent in London to receive each Number, and pay the amount of the Subscription.

A correct List of Subscribers' Names will be recorded in the Work; and each Subscriber will have his own name only printed in red ink, which may hereafter render his copy of more value to his family or friends.

The Number already subscribed are 73 *large* and 846 *small*; a List of which, together with the Materials for the Improvement of the New Edition, is inserted in Nos. XIX. and XX. of the CLASSICAL JOURNAL; and may be had gratis at all the Classical Booksellers in London; and at Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane.

The Subscription will soon be closed.

No. I. will be published in October, 1815.

CONTENTS OF NO. XXIII.

BISHOP Pearson's Minor Tracts, chronologically arranged,	
No. iv.	1
Remarks on Dr. Johnson's Latin Epitaph on Mr. Thrale.	6
Collatio Codicis Harleiani 5674 cum Odyssea editionis Ernestinæ, No. v.	7
Remarks on Latin Metre.	10
Notice of Mr. J. Jones' Grammar of the Greek Tongue.	23
Notice of Brunck's Anacreon, edited by G. H. Schaefer.	27
Observationes Criticæ in Euripidem.	30
Account of the Prices and Purchasers of the most valuable articles in the collection of the late J. Edwards, Esq.	35
Inquiry into the causes of the Diversity of Human Character in various Ages, Nations, and Individuals. By the late Professor Scott, No. vi.	41
Biblical Synonyma, No. iv.	67
A passage in Cicero's Cato Major illustrated.	73
Answer to Mr. Bellamy's Essay on the Hebrew Points, and on the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, No. iii.	77
On the different Latin Poetical expressions to render the English verb <i>to run</i>	84
Remarks on Mr. Blomfield's edition of the Persæ of Æschylus.	90
Bentleii Emendationes Ineditæ in Aristophanem—In Ranas, No. iii.	104
On the 77th verse of the Hippolytus.	111
The gallantry of Saladin and his Brother Malek Adel. By Mr. Hammer.	118

Recherches Sur Apollon, et sur divers points de Grammaire ; par J. B. Gail	115
Notice of Collatio Versionis Syriacæ quam Peschito vocant, cum Fragmentis in Commentariis Ephraemi Syri obviis instituta a M. Gottl. Leb. Spohn.	124
Answer to a late book written against the Learned and Reve- rend Dr. Bentley, with an examination of Mr. Bennett's Appen- dix to the said book. No. v.	128
Wallace, a Cambridge Prize Poem.	145
Observations on the "Remarks in Sir W. Drummond's Disserta- tion on Gen. xlix."	149
Richardi Bentleii Epistolæ Duæ ad Ti. Hemsterhusium.	157
On the Margites of Homer.	161
Dr. Crombie's Remarks on the notice of his Gymnasium, sive Symbola Critica, No. II.	167
The Life of Isaac Casaubon.	172
Ode Græca, In Obitum Gul. Craven, D. D. Coll. Div. Joan. Capt. haud ita pridem dignissimi Magist.	184
Cambridge Prize Poems, for 1815.	186
Sir William Browne's Medals.	191
Biblical Criticism.	193
Lockett's Arabic Syntax.	194
Notice of Tiberius Rhetor de Figuris, una cum Rufi Arte Rheto- rica. Edidit Jo. Fr. Boissonade.	198
On the word Palimpsestus.	204
Cambridge Prize Poem for 1790—Ode Latina.	206
On the Prosody of Greek Verse, as connected with dialect.	208
Adversaria Literaria.	209
Mots, ou Omis par H. Etienne, ou inexactement expliqués, Par J. B. Gail.	215
Literary Intelligence.	220
Notes to Correspondents.	235

CONTENTS OF NO. XXIV.

BIBLICAL Criticism	237
Notice of Utriusque Leonidæ Carmina, Ed. Alb. Christ. Meineke.	
<i>Lips.</i>	239
Notice of Hamilton's General Introduction to the Study of the Hebrew Scriptures, &c.	240
Oratio Habita Cantabrigiæ: octavo Kalendas Junii MDCCCLV.	
Perorante Gul. Maskelyne, A. M.	241
Remarks on 1 Tim. iii. 16.	247
Remarks on the Meaning of the Hebrew word מִלְחָמָה	253
Remarks on the Defence of Gabriel Sionita	254
Remarks on some Statements of the Rt. Hon. Sir W. Drummond	256
Arabian Tales, originally Persian	259
Momi Miscellanea Subseciva, No. III.	261
Inquiry into the Causes of the Diversity of Human Character in various Ages, Nations, and Individuals, by PROFESSOR SCOTT, No. VII	263
Prometheus. An English Prize Poem: Spoken at the Apposition, St. Paul's School. April, 1815	273
Remarks on the Cambridge MS. of the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles	276
Notice of Rich's Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon	287
Biblical Criticism: Hebrew Descent of the Abyssinians	293
On the Greek and Latin Accents. No. III.	304
De Lectione Κηροπλάστας in Archilochi Fragm. ap. Plutarchum	325
An Inquiry into the Nature and Efficacy of Imitative Versification, Ancient, and Modern	329
D. Heinsii Oratio De Utilitate, quæ e lectione Tragœdiarum percipitur	340

CONTENTS.

In Carmina Epodica Æschylea Commentarius. Auctore G. B.	344
Bentleii Emendationes ineditæ in Aristophanem in Equites	352
Classical Criticism	367
An Answer to a late Book written against the learned and Rev.	
Dr. Bentley, relating to some MS. Notes on Callimachus, Together with an Examination of Mr. Bennet's Appendix to the said Book. Concluded	370
Notice of Frey's Hebrew, Latin, and English Dictionary	381
Notice of Dr. H. Marsh's Horæ Pelasgicæ	383
E. H. Barker's Epistola ad G. H. Schæferum De quibusdam He- sydij et Etymologicis Glossis	393
Notice of Poetæ Minores Græci. Edidit Th. Gaisford	410
Notulae Quædam in Platonis Menexenum	415
Notice of a Grammar of the Persian Language. By M. Lums- den, LL. D.	420
Notice of the Megha Duta, by Calidasa; translated from the Sanskrit by H. H. Wilson	432
Biblical Criticism	436
Bentleii Epistolæ duæ ad Ti. Hemsterhusium, No. II.	438
Adversaria Literaria, No. VIII.	450
ΑΠΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΓΑΛΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ, sive Apologia	
Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ, auctore Jo. Juello, olim Episcopo Sa-	
risb. Græce quidem reddita a Jo. Smith, A. B. Nuper reen-	
suit et notas addidit A. C. Campbell, A. M.	456
Mots ou omis par H. Etienne, ou inexactement expliqués. Par J. B. Gail, No. II.	463
Europides Emendatus	467
Virgil explained	470
Notes of some of the Principal Books of the celebrated Library of Ralph Willett, Esq	473
Literary Intelligence	479
Notes to Correspondents	480

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL

N^o. XXIII.

SEPTEMBER, 1815.



BISHOP PEARSON'S MINOR TRAGEDIES
CHRONOLOGICALLY ARRANGED.

No. iv.—*Continued from No. xix. p. 99.*

NO. VIII.
NO NECESSITY
OF
REFORMATION
OF THE
PUBLICK DOCTRINE
OF THE
CHURCH OF ENGLAND
By JOHN PEARSON, D. D.
LONDON:

Printed by J. G. for Nathaniel Brook, at the Angel in Cornhill.
1660.

NO. IX.

AN
ANSWER
TO
Dr. BURGESS
HIS
WORD,
BY WAY OF
POSTSCRIPT.

In Vindication of No Necessity of Reformation of the Publick Doctrine
of the *Church of England.*

BY
JOHN PEARSON, D. D.¹

LONDON:

Printed by J. G., for Nathaniel Brook at the Angel in Cornhill.
1660.

No. X.

CRITICI SACRI:²
stvs
DOCTISSIMORUM VIRORUM
IN
SS. BIBLIA
ANNOTATIONES,
&
TRACTATUS.

*Opus summa curâ recognitum, & In novem Tomos divisum.
Quid in hoc Opere praestitum sit Praefatio ad Lectorem ostendit*

LONDINI,

Excudebat JACOBUS FLESHFR, MDCLX.

<i>Prostant apud</i>	CORNELIUM BEE	{	Londoni
	RICHARDUM ROYSTON		
	GUilielmum Wells		
	SAMUELUM THOMSON		
	THOMAM ROBINSON Oxonii.		
	GUilielmum MORDEN Cantabrigie.		

¹ These two pamphlets were reprinted by Dr. George Hicks, in his *Bibl. Script. Ecclesiastica*, Vol. 1. Lond. 1709.—T. K.

² Dr. Pearson was the principal of four persons engaged in this Work. T. K.

SERENISSIMO
POTENTISSIMOQUE PRINCIPI
CAROLO SECUNDO,
MAGNÆ BRITANNIÆ, FRANCIAE, ET HIBERNIAE
REGI,
FIDEI DEFENSORI,
BONV RUM LITERARUM PATRONO,
PACIS ET INCOLOMITATIS
PUBLICÆ INSTAURATORI CUSTODIQUE,
CORNELIUS BEE
MAJESTATI EJUS DEVOTISSIMUS
D. D. D.

LECTORI
PIO ET ERUDITO.

PRODIIT nuper, et nunc inter manus hominum versatur, Librorum optimus, *BIBLIA* scilicet ΠΟΛΥΤΑΩΤΤΑ, editionem feliciter procurante Viro admodum Reverendo *BRIANO WALTONO*, S. T. D. aliusque Viris Cl. de Religione et S. literis quād optūmē meritis: Enī jam prodit tibi, Lector pie et erudit, (Tibi enim soli utrinque et servatur et metitur, tibi soli utrunque prelum insudavit, et Waltonianum, et Nostrum) prodit, īquam, Liber (si ita loqui fas sit) δειτερόποτος, primo tantū posterior, optimōque proximus, *CRITICI* nimirūm *SACRI*. Quid enim post literas natas melius, quid optabilius, quād ut primān S. Scripturæ Textus originales unā cum Versionibus antiquis Ἰπ̄ο μιαρ ἀνοψιν redigerentur, adeò ut simul ac semel omnia et conspici et conferri possent; dein et ejusdem S. Scripturæ sensus, quem vocant, Literalis et Grammaticus, qui ipsissima Scriptura est atque ipsummet Dei Verbum, a Viris eruditione, ingenio, judicio instructissimis erugetur? Illud autem Viri quos modò dixi, Viri s̄epius, semper menērandi, surama cum accuratione ante triennium præstiterunt; Hoc verò præcipue *CORNELII BEE*, hominis ad antiquiores meliorēsque litteras juvandas nati, curæ et impensis acceptum ferimus. Is enī verè οργάνωμος quicquid vel ex snapte p̄critiā vel ex indicatione alienā dignum compererat, id om̄e seduld conquiātum h̄i hanc Thesaurum Sacram, in hanc Catenam Biblicam, vel, si mavis (nec enim facile est tantum Opus satis amplio titulo coherestare) in hanc Bibliothecam Hagiocriticam,* sicut Apis *puro distendit nectare cellas*, congessit et in tuos usus recordidit. Enī vero quotquot uspiam αξιομνησευτόρεα in Divinis Voluminibus occurunt, Res, Personæ, Actiones, Loca, Tempora, Regiones, Urbes, Templa, Instrumenta, Vasa, Pondera, Mensuræ, Nummi, Habitus, Gestus, Munera, Ritus, Leges, Consuetudines, omnia, doct̄e h̄ic et dilucidè enarrantur. H̄ic non solum explicantur Typorum mysteria, Prophetiarum et Parabolarum ænigmata, adēque universa S. Textūs loca difficultiora, quin et insuper vocum ipsarum origines, usus, significata, imò apices nonnunquam et minutiae

pensiculatiōēs examinantur. Hic exhibetur quicquid ad Divinas paginas vel Synagogae Rabbini vel Ecclesiæ Doctore, subtiliōēs annotārant. Hic componuntur, Sacrosancta Dei Oracula cum exterorum monumen-tis, Hebræorum Leges cum institutis Gentilium, Odæ Davidi, Solo-pomis Parœmiæ, aliorumque Scriptorum ~~theopneustarw~~ Gnomæ cum Ethnicorū Poetarū, Rhetorū, Philosophorum sententiis parallelis. Hic denique (quod optimum est interpretandi genū) videre est mirum SS. Codicum consensum concentrumque, alteriusq[ue] ut *Alter poscit opem locus, et conjurat amicē.* Sed non opus est ut hederam hic nostram pratexamus: Inspice Catalogum, et invenies Nomina omni lauro, omni laude majora. Quis singulorum fuerit Annotatorum scopus, quod consilium negotiūmque, ex ipsorum, quas Catalogo subjunxi-mus, Praefationibus constabit melius, optimè ex Opere. **ANNOTA-TIONES**, quæ in septem usque Tomos excreverunt, duobus insuper **TRACTATUUM** Tomis cumulantur: de quibus hoc tantum nos dixisse sufficiat. Hi etiam et ipsi *Annotationes* sunt, idque et *Criticae*, et *Sacrae*, saltem dignissimi qui Annotationibus ejusmodi quasi Appendix et *Itinerarij* adjiciantur. Jam quæ nostræ in hoc Opere partes fuerint restat ut exponamus: quod, ne te diutiū morem patetis accipe. Hoc in primis tibi penitus persuasum iri cupimus, nō expetimus, et exspectamus; Nos non cianum hic commiscuisse, aut consarcinasse centonem, verū Auctores tibi exhibere integros et illibatos.* Adeò enim nobis penè religio fuit ipsos mutilare, ut etiam ubi alterius verba usurpat unus, et item alter, deinde tertius, atque ita ad eundem locum eadem non sensu tantum sed et verbis plures commentantur, nos eadē verba, licet aliquantulū gravatae, identidem reposuerimus, veriti scilicet, si ullibi vel superflua omissemus, ne quis alibi et neces-saria nos omissemus suspicaretur. Aliiquid tamen juris nobis metipsis permisimus, idque e re tuā, ut speramus, et cum bona venuim: Nam nou solūn quām plurima quæ oscitabundi Typographi χερη et pro-miscue ediderant, sed quædam etiam quæ Auctores ipsi in alieniorem locum rejecerant, nos opportuno et suo colloquavimus. Sic quatuor illi Annotationum rivi quos tumultuario quodam impetu magnus ille eruditio[nis] torrens JO. DRUSIUS in N. F. profudit, jam in unum alveum collecti leui cursu habuntur. Sic quæ H. GROTIUS ὁ πάντα ad Decalogum, ad Ephe. 1.: ad 2 Thess. 2. 1. 12. ad Jac. 2. 14., &c. ad 1 Joh. 18—24. & 3. 9. & 4. 1—5. item ad Apoc. 13. & 17. fusiūs disseruit, et certas ob causas Annotatis ad Euangelia subjuxit, in hac nostra Editione proprias singula stationes obtinent. Eiusdem Viri Cl. Appendix ad interpretationem locorum N. T. quæ de Anti-christo agunt aut agere putantur, Annotata ad Apoc. 17. immediate subsequitur. Reliquorum quæ sparsim interseruimus sedes tibi indigita-bant Catalogi. Optima semper exemplaria secuti sumus; veruntamen ad errata ipsorum corrigenda, et supplendas lacunas, p[ro]p[ter]a non tard nobis subsidio fuerunt. Quæ in Catalogo asteriscis præfixis insig-nificantur, nunc primum in lucem prodeunt: reliqua antea excusa nos deruo tibi representamus. Loca vel ex SS. Scripturis vel aliunde citata diligenter examinavimus, atq[ue] inibi deprehendimus multa mendarum millia, quas aut preli incuria fuderat, aut Scriptores, ut sit, nimium

properantes parum caverant. Omnia summiā quā potuimus curā recentissimus: Quae in manifesto errore fenebantur; purgavimus; ubi res erat in dubio, conjecturis duntaxat * adhibitis, liberum tibi reliquimus judicium. Characteres, quoties opus fuit, rite variavimus, et pravis interpunctionibus sublatis substituimus aptiores, atque ita locis obscuris et involutis emphasis suam dedimus et perspicuitatem. Denique non pudet, inīd juvat, meminisse quantum negotii nobis facerent minutiæ Typographicae, quodque per integrum ferē sexennium literulis, numerorum notis, punctis, accentibus intenti fuerimus, et tantum non immersi. Hęc enim utcunq; nūgā videantur, tamen *seria, ducent in mala* ubi fuerint neglecta; et quiequid tuo conimodo pōterit inservire, nos nec nimis durum unquam judicabimus, nec nobis indignum.—Vale; utere, fruere laboribus, eoque boni consule.

JO. PEARSON *Archidiaconus Suriensis.*

ANT. SCATTERGOOD *Ecclesiae Lincolniensis
Canonici.*

FRA. GOULDMAN *Ecclesiae Okendon Australis
in Comitatu Essexie Rector.*

RIČ. PEARSON *Coll. Reg. Socius.*

CORNELIUS BEE LECTORI.

Ne quis nobis vel operis vel preti magnitudinem objiciat, sciat ipsius et compendio communio magnopere a nobis esse consaltum. Hic enim libri circa nonaginta, iisque integri, in novem coierunt, et libri plus minus quinquaginta (nuper vix aut ne vix minoris haec omnia coemisses) jam ad quindenas rediguntur. Non est igitur quod de nobis justè queratur quispian; est quod sibi et aliis plurimū gratuletur.

NO. XI.

In 1661, Dr. Pearson was appointed in his Majesty's Commission to bear a part in the debate at the Savoy, about the alteration of the Book of Common Prayer, &c.

NO. XII.

A BRIEF ACCOUNT OF SOME EXPRESSIONS IN SAINT ATHANASIUS HIS CREED:

For the satisfaction of those who think themselves thereby oblig'd to believe all things, therein contain'd to be absolutely necessary to Salvation.

OXFORD,
Printed by Henry Hall, Printer to the University
for Tho. Robinson, 1663.

REMARKS
ON
DR. JOHNSON'S LATIN EPITAPH
ON MR. THRALE.

HAVING observed Dr. Johnson's Latin Epitaph on Mr. Thrale, published in your XVth No. p. 139, I am tempted to offer some remarks upon it, lest the general authority of his great name may mislead the young and inexperienced among your readers, in matters in which it is wholly undeserving of authority; his acquirements in what is called classical literature having been very limited and superficial; and when he undertook Latin composition, he was too proud to doubt, and too indolent to inquire; as this Epitaph abundantly proves.

In the first place, *seu*, occurring twice in line 3, is only employed by writers of good times as a connective of *alternatives* or *opposites*, never of *conjuncts*: it joins things, *one*, ~~not~~, *both*, of which we mean to state *or* affirm; so that the commendation of Mr. Thrale for *res seu domesticus seu civiles* can only belong to either *private*, or *public* matters, not to *both*, as intended.

The phrase too, *res civiles* or *domesticas agere*, must mean either *to agitate them*, as a *disturber*, or *exhibit them*, as an *actor* on the stage. To express the meaning intended, it should have been, *in rebus quum civilibus tuu domesticis ita se gessit, ut,* &c. or *in rebus et civilibus et domesticis*, &c.

Multi, in line 4, is feeble and frigid. He might have written, without incurring the imputation of extravagant compliment, *qui inscerent omnes*.

Res sacras agere, (line 5.) is still more fatly than *res civiles* or *domesticas agere*; meaning, in its primary and obvious sense, *to agitate or move things forbidden*; and, if admissible at all in a sense like what is here intended, must mean to *perform the sacred functions of a priest or minister of the church*, not merely to *discharge punctually the ordinary moral duties of religion*.

Quam brevem (vitum) esset habiturus præscire, (line 6.) can only signify *prescience of the brevity of life prior to its commencement*: for *qui vitum habiturus est*, is *one who is to have life*, not *one who already has it*. It should have been, *quam brevis esset concessu scire videtur*; or more properly *ipse præsentire videtur*: for such is the proper verb; and the addition of the emphatical pronoun would have given strength and spirit to the antithesis.

Sibique semper similis, (line 7.) is one of those quaint puerilities which so frequently disgrace the works of Ovid and Tasso. *Sibique semper æqualis* would have been durable.

If by, *nihil ostentavit aut arte fictum aut cura elaboratum*, (lines 8—9.) be meant that he ostentatiously displayed nothing skilfully contrived or carefully executed, the expression is just and adequate: but if it be intended to signify that he showed nothing artificial or affected in his manners, it should have been, *nihil aut simulatum aut confitum ostendit*.

Regi patriaque fideliter studuit, (lines 10—11.) is, I believe, faulty; though, *regis dignitati, patriaque libertati, or prosperitati, fideliter studuit*, would have been proper.

The numeral *mille*, used indefinitely as in line 13, belongs, I believe, to light, loose, or comic modes of expression only, and seems noways adapted to the solemnity of a sepulchral inscription. Perhaps the writer's meaning had been properly and accurately expressed by, *inter assiduo ingruentia mercatura negotia*.

The word *nepote*; in line 30, is so employed, as to signify the grandson of the person commemorated, not the person himself, which the writer evidently intends. It should have been *cum eo*, instead of *cum nepote*.

In critical, philological, grammatical, or philosophical disquisitions I would by no means be a rigid exactor of purity, it not being in all cases possible to find ancient modes of diction adequate to modern modes of thought; and distinctness, perspicuity, and precision of sense, like Lord Bacon's, are cheaply obtained, even by all the barbarisms of his Latin, gross and manifold as they are: but in compositions which can pretend to no higher merits than those of expression, the expression should at least be faultless.

COLLATIO CODICIS HARLEIANI 5674

CUM ODYSSEA EDITIONIS ERNESTINÆ 1760.

No. v.—*Continued from No. XXII. p. 206.*

386. αὐτοῦ.

387. τὸ δὲ ἴλιον ἀγλοταρχεῖσθαι τοῦ
ἵχοτες.

392. βάκτη.

393. σιδήσεων γε.

395. ὑμαξέν et super a prius a.

404. νίντα δι' ἀμβούσιν et supra γε. δι' ὄφραιν.

405. μή τις οὐ.

406. κτίσιν ex emend.

411. νόσον δ' et sic citat Scholiastes supra ad 275, vbi etiam ἀληνασθαι.

412. Post hunc additur in margine versus, τοῦ γὰρ δὴ πάις ἴστις ταῦτη δὲ σὸς ἔχεται εἰναι.

413. ἴγέλωτος φίλοις ἥτοε, sed γεγένη super ἥτοε.

428. τοῖς ἔπι.

444. υπατατος δ' a m. secunda, sed antiqua.

445. λαχυνῶ. Schol. γε. καὶ λάχυν παρανύσσως τῇ λάχυν.

451. γε. ποθεῖν, sed potius credo referendum ad 453. vbi textus πιθίσις, v suprascripto a manu se- cunda, sed antiqua.

455. γε. ἔμεινεν ὅλεθρον.

457. ὁ τι την (sic).

459. θεοφόρου et supra glossa τυπτόμενου, φόστεα v finale textus in σι mutauit. Mox καδδὺ ἤδη τῷ, sed in marg. pro var. lect. καδδίκιον.

464. πιον et α super ι.

468. ἀνὰ δ' et supra ι.

477. σεγίς ἔμειλλο.

482. 539. πός a m. pr. et sic K. 127.

483. τυτθόν.

484. ἐκλεισθη, sed v super ι.

485. τὴν δ' ἀψώ οὔτως schol. marg.

489. κάπησον ιν.

491. ἀπῆμεν. In marg. πιανος πλησσοντες:

499. ὄφραιντι. Quæ verior est scriptura. MS. Hesychii, Μαργιάνη πολιάντι, partim recte.

502. εἰ καὶ τις σταταχθοῖσιν citat Schol. supra ad 106.

504. πτελίποθος, sed vulgatum

530.

516. ἀλέσοις, sed ας super ας et pro interpretatione, ἴτυφλοντας ἵκε-

ταισθαις. Deinde ἴδημασθαι et supra, συστο.

520. αἰκίς θλητός.

523. Ψυχῆς γα et τι supra γι.

528. κλύτη.

533. ἦν nunc, sed ει erasum.

539. προπάροιδη et supra γε. μηδέποιδη.

540. 542. ἵπι τοῦ προτίσου ἀβετεῖται. πᾶς γὰρ ἐμπαλιν ἡγεμόνη :

553. ἵπασος οδ' et η super αιον. Post οδ' additum αε' m. antiqua. Legi igitur volut emendator, μηδὲ ικά, ο δ' αε' οὐκ

554. ἀλλ' οὐδε μερμένησιν et ζ in ξ mutatum. In marg. γε. ἀλλ' αε'

559. δὴ τίτη κ. et sic K. 186.

561. ἰστερύνας et ου super ας.

ΟΔΥΣΣ. Κ.

6. νῖτις a m. pr. ηβάνωτες.

7. ἀκοτις a m. pr. , in α mutauit manus recentior.

11. αιδολης.

12. τερποῖς λέχεσσι. Schol. marg. τερποῖσι.

13. γε. καὶ τείχια μακρά.

16. καὶ μέν. Mox κατεπλέξην, sed i super α secundum, et α super α.

19. δῶκε δὲ μοι ἴστολας.

30. ἴστρας et ι super ας ab eadem manu. Schol. marg. ἴστρις ιριστης.

31. ἴπιλλαβε.

39. γε. καὶ δώματος ικητα..

41. ζηροδοτος ικτελίσσεται.

42. εἰκάδη ιπισθόμιτα.

43. ταῦδη ιδωκα-in text. In marg. ταῦδη ιδωκις: οὕτως ιρισταρχος. ἀλλοι δὲ τὰ δόμικα. καὶ τὰ γ' ιδωκα. καὶ τάγη

δάμας ἡρωδίαστος.

58. σίτοις τ' ἐπιστόμαιοι.

62. ἀλθότις, δὲ ἀναδάμαντ' ἐπιστειρωθεῖ-

σιν. γε. πρὸς δῆμα παρὰ στιθμάσιν.

65. Videtur a m. pr. fuisse ὅρῃ

ἀντὶ ἵκησι.

70. κακοῖσι, sed linea transuersa
damnatum, et supraſc. μελακοῖσι. [Nisi merus est error, volebat
καλοῖσι.] In marg. ξινόδοτος μελ-
ακοῖσιν ἀμεβόμενος γεράφι.

75. ἕρῃ ἐπεὶ ἀλανάτοτοισι.

93. κυματ'. Primo fuit γ' pro
τ', sed nihil in accentibus mutauit.
Qifod si alterum consilio scripsis-
set, ita notasset, κύμα γ'. Apolloni-
us v. ἀεξέτο habet κυματ'.

100. τρέζειν.

103. γε. η. καὶ ἀμαξαι.

106. θυγάτερ (sic).

107. κατεβήσατο.

110. τῶιδ' text. et schol. τὸ δὲ

σίσιν ἀεισταχος διὰ τοῦ τ.

116. διῆτιν et supra γε. δέρπον.

118. τεῦξαι et.χι supra ξει.

123. ἀνδρῶν τ.

124. πινοντο text. In schol. πι-
νοντο ἀεισταχος φεροντο. Paullo ante
Schol. αεισταχοντος ιχθύος δὲ εἰς εἰροτις.
• 126. ἔγινεν ἄσσος.

129. Φίγουμεν.

• 130. οἴδ' ἄμα: τοῦτο μὲν ἐμφαντι-
κόν. ἔνιοι δὲ γε. οἴδ' ἄλλα πάντες. καὶ
λιστρατος δὲ καὶ ρίανος διὰ τοῦ λ. οἴδ'
ἄλλα πάντες; -- [Marius librarii in vlti-
mis aberrauit; volebat οἴδ' ἄλλα
πάντες, quod etiam coniecit Tou-
pius Cur. Nou. in Suid. v. ἀρίστην.
Suidas quidem et Apollonius ha-
bent ἄμα, sed ἄλλα fortiter defen-
dunt loca a Toupio laudata, supra
H. 328, infra N. 78.]

136. ἀεισταχοντος οὐδέποστα,

140. τῆα.

146. παρὰ et ἀπὸ suprascr.

• 152. διῆτον et suprascr. γε. κακοῖσι.

156. τῆας.

160. ξινόδοτος δὲν γέρε μη.

164. γε. διὰ τοῦ μ. ἐπιστόμαιος. Ιτι-
βας· πλησιάσκεις ἢ τὸ λᾶς in στήλης
ζάς:

166. οἴφοι.

169. καταλοφαδια schol. marg.

170. οὐποις ἥν: δεισιστοφάτης δὲ εὐ-
ποις ὑγιειν.

174. εὐ γέρε πα καταδυστόμαιοι, sed
συπρα ε additum.

175. ἐπέλθη. text. ἴτιλην schol.

178. ἦ τισι τὸ οὔτως φίρεται: —
(pro ἀκα).

188. ρίανος δὲ τέτ' ἔγινεν μ. θ. μετὰ
μῆνον ἔπιπον:

220. ἀεισταχος γε. ἔπιπον δὲν προ-
θύροισιν:

224. πολίτης (Πολίτης est error
typorum).

Inter 233. et 234. additur in

marg. β. τιγχειν δὲ κυκιῶ χεροῖν
δίπται δέρπα πλειστον.

239. 240. τρίχατος καὶ δέρμας.
Schol. ξινόδοτος καὶ πόδες γε. καὶ in
ἄλλω φυτών τε τρίχας τε καὶ δέρματα:

242. πάρῃ ἄκυλον. In schol.
παρῃ ἄκυλον: ἀεισταχος εὐκ οίδε τὸ
στιχον. ὀδέκατλοιστρατος ἀντ' αὐτοῦ γε.
πατός με υἱην ιτίθει μελιδια κατεπόν.

249. ἀγαζόμειοι. In marg. in
ἄλλω ἀγαζόμενα.

253. omittit, et mox 265.

268. ἄξεις et γ' super ἄ. In marg.
ἀεισταχος ἀντ' τοῦ σῦνον: (Ita nempe
explicat σῦνον.)

281. τῇ δ' αὐτῷ ἡ διεστησι.

285. σύ γ'.

287. δ' omittit.

288. ἀλύληστοι.

296. κακοῖσι et ε additum su-
per ε prius. In schol. κακοῖσιται.

306. ζωσιν. et supra γε. δύκη-
ται.

316. τιγχειν. Deinde δίπται et in
marg. in ἄλλω. γέρει ὑπὸ λιπηροῦ:

[lege ἵν αλλοι, δίπτα', ὁ γάρ οὐδὲ λ.]

320 λίξο et in marg. οὐτὸς αει-
σταχος διουλλάβως το λίξο. ἀδηλον δὲ
πότερον καιροῦ οὐ συναρτιών: [Legi
συναρτιών. Videntur quidam le-
gisse λίξ' elisum pro λίξο, quod
plenum exstat Il. I. 639. Postea
ε λίξ, nota elisionis neglecta, fac-

tum est λίξι.]

324. και μι ἐλοφυζόμενη: ἀριστοφ-
άν. και μι λισσομένη και ἔστιν εὖ
ἀχαρις η γραφή.

326. οὐ οὗτοι et πᾶς super ος.

329. ο σιδύνας φονιν ἀλιτύσθαι το
στίχον.

334. επιβιγμεν.

REMARKS ON LATIN METRE,

More particularly of a short vowel being lengthened when followed by the consonants sp—sc—st—and sm.

THE true method of ascertaining the force of the consonants above mentioned is certainly taken in the first No of the *Classical Journal*, where the authorities for and against the observance of it are laid before us. A writer on Latin Metre, in the third No of your Journal, under the signature of L. makes several assertions on the subject, in few of which I can acquiesce, and to which I shall take the liberty of replying in the present Essay. That the metrical canon advanced by Terentianus Maurus, and supported by Dawes, is in general acknowledged by the classical scholars of the present day, I by no means admit; the weight of authorities on the question will be adverted to in another part of this Essay.—From the manner in which L writes, I do not believe him to be an Etonian; yet as he adopts the metrical canons which the gentlemen of Eton maintain, in answering him I shall take the liberty of controverting the three metrical canons of that school, which are the following.

First, that a short final vowel is lengthened when followed by the consonant *p*—&c.

Secondly, that such words as *seritu*, *officu*, *consiliu*, *imperiu*, are not to be admitted in the genitive-case as words of four syllables.

Thirdly, that the letter O is not a short vowel, nor admissible in Latin verbs as short, when scanned with another short vowel, for example, *tendo* *chilys*, *caligō futuri*, *faragō libelli*, *præponō* *Sā-
buria*, instances of which occur in every page of Statius, Juvenal,
and Martial.

The gentlemen of Eton are excellent Latin scholars, and happily cultivate the Latin Muse. Being learned, they are also liberal, and will hear with candor objections to their system. I propose to consider the metrical canons in the order I have stated them. I begin with the first of them, of short vowels being lengthened when followed by the consonants *sp*—&c.

Some among the Greeks have accounted the letter S merely an aspiration, in which number is Plato. Many of the learned

among them avoided the frequent use of it. The Romans, following the example of their masters, softened this letter down to a mere aspiration. The comic poets write *audin'*, *credin'*, instead of *audisne*, *credisne*. The other old Latin poets in many instances consider it as a mere aspiration before a short syllable, and even before a long; witness the following sort of verses, which occur in every page of Lucretius:

Nam si de nūtilo fierent ex omnib's rebus. l. 1.

Nam fierent juvenc's subito ex infantib's paivis. ib.

Sive foras fertur non est ea fini's profecto. ib.

Sicne licet gigni posse ex nou sensib's sensus. l. 2.

In this last quoted verse *s* is made both an aspiration and a letter; and many similar instances can be produced. I contend therefore from the preceding premises, that *S* was considered anciently by the Romans as either an aspiration, or a letter, as it suited a poet's convenience. I admit that the writers of the Augustan age, in general, but not always, abstained from making it a mere aspiration, probably from some change which had taken place in the pronunciation of the language. Your correspondent L. has the following words: "It is a curious thing that, in an author who pretends to treat of the art of Poetry, there should be two false quantities in two consecutive syllables—

Convulsu' temis rostrisque stridentibus æquor.

Those who would read *tridentibus* to favor Vida would act as Nero to Lucan, *beneficio Nertvns fama servata*, they would give him his death blow." This is not a line of Vida's, it is a line from Virgil, to be found *AEn.* 5. v. 143, and again in *AEn.* 8. v. 690. It is so given in all the old editions of Virgil. the modern indeed have *tridentibus*. I have a quarto edition of Virgil now before me, printed at Paris in the year 1520, which gives the line in both places with the word *stridentibus*. Vida merely quotes the line as he found it in his own Virgil, deeming it a line suiting the subject of his Poetics. The Editor of the Variorum Virgil says that the first syllable in *stri'len's* being looked upon as long by grammarians, this verse has much puzzled them, and they have endeavoured to substitute in its place *sonantibus*, *uentibus*, and *tridentibus*, and then adds, "sed lectiones hujusmodi in *nullo* ex antiquis exemplaribus offendit, quum vero bona codicum antiquorum pars rostrisque *stridentibus* habeat." This Editor says that *ost'risque stridentibus* is merely a conjectural reading from the University of Naples, in which, however, (though he thinks *stridentibus* may be well supported) he acquiesces, because in some ancient pictures, and coins, prows of Roman vessels with three projections, somewhat like a Trident, may be observed. Although your correspondent L. styles this line a puerility of Vida, yet most judges, I believe, will admit it to be a very forcible line, and strongly expressive of a vessel dashing through the water with great violence.

That Virgil himself deemed it such is apparent from his repeating it a second time, a practice, though Homeric, by no means common with him. I think there are sundry objections to *tridentibus*. We cannot imagine that Virgil, describing a vessel rushing with great rapidity through the water, would stop to mention the shape of the prow. Besides *rostris* properly requires the union of an adjective, *tridentibus* is a substantive. L. himself strongly objects to *tridentibus*, but now, when he discovers it to be a Virgilian verse, it is incumbent on him to remove the difficulty, and inform us how the line is to be read. The difficulty in the case is, that the first syllable is in no other place found short, but, for what we know to the contrary, it may have been common. Perhaps Virgil, thinking the word strong and expressive, might, like Lucretius and the old Latin writers, deem the *S* at the beginning of it, a mere aspiration, and in this instance think proper to adopt the ancient custom. This is not the only instance of a Virgilian line where *S* is cut off in the manner of Lucretius :

Linina tectorum et medii's in penetralibus hostem.

This reading Pierius, Farnaby, and others insist, is the true one.* There are many reasons to support *stridentibus*. All good manuscripts concur in it.—The word is repeated a second time with the same concurrence.—There is no substitute given for it except from mere conjecture—The verse expresses forcibly the sense which Virgil meant to convey to his readers—Strong manuscript authority is not to be laid aside from conjecture. I may at all events, however, here take notice, that whatever may be thought of the preceding observations, the question in dispute by no means depends upon the verses mentioned : the cause I support can be fully maintained without them. There seems no pretence to say that a short vowel before any two other consonants, except those beginning with *sp*, &c. is made long in Latin verse by such position, so that at all events if there be such a metrical rule, it is contrary to analogy, and to the general practice of the Roman writers, and therefore requires strong evidence to support it.

The pronunciation of the Latin language is entirely lost ; if we merely consult our ears, these consonants *sp*—&c. no more offend us than any two other consonants, for instance the following verse :

Nos pavidi trepidare metu, crinemque flagrantem
Excutere—

In the word *flagrans* there are six consonants, and only two vowels, yet no one pretends to say that his ear is offended by the first syllable of the word being short. Virgil in another place makes *flagrans* long—*Flagrantes perfusa genas*. This subject therefore can only be determined by attending to the practice of the Roman

* See also Æneid. XII. 709. where *decernere* is the old and general reading. Ed.

writers. In the first Number of your Journal, you give us this practice, by which let the matter be determined.

Strong symptoms of a bad cause appear, when it cannot be maintained without the destruction of all authorities hitherto deemed incontrovertible; and when this destruction is to be accomplished, not by argument, but by *an ipse dixit*. These levellers of authorities are not unlike those of the present day, who style themselves Christians, yet deny the validity of those parts of the Scriptures which militate against their tenets and doctrines, and scruple not to strike them out of their Bibles. L. says that the only authorities with regard to Latin metre, are the Odes of Horace, Virgil, and Catullus. So that the greater part of Horace, all Ovid, Lucretius, Propertius, Tibullus, and all the later writers, with one fell swoop are put *hors de combat*. I cannot submit to this short method of deciding the question, but shall now take the liberty of making some observations on the authorities mentioned in your Journal.

The old Latin writers had no notion of any such metrical canon. There appear ten examples in Lucretius of the nonobservance of it, and none for it.

Propertius too is entirely against it.

In Virgil there are three against it, and one of very doubtful authority for it.

In Ovid there are nineteen against it, and not one for it. I am aware that some of the examples against it in Ovid are attempted to be invalidated by various readings, but to this I shall presently reply.

As to Catullus, the great authority with L., he may fairly be put out of the question, he cannot prejudice our cause. This author being a great admirer of the Grecian writers, and his best poems being probably translations from them, followed the Grecian rule of making a short syllable long before any two consonants. But that rule is not countenanced by any other Roman writer, yet Catullus has the following line:

Testis erit magnis virtutibus unda Scamandri.

So that, as youi excellent correspondent in your 19th No. (p. 122,) observes, "if this line is the only instance in which Catullus has not lengthened a final vowel before any two consonants whatever, instead of asserting that he attributed a peculiar power to *sc*, *sp*, or *st*, we ought to conclude that *sc* was weaker than any other combination."

Let us now see what can be urged against the overwhelming authority in opposition to the rule.

Lucretius and Propertius are not writers of the Augustan age, they are too ancient; at all events they show the ancient practice. They clearly prove the rule (if any such there be) to be

an innovation. The chief reliance of those who support the canon appears to be on one single line of Virgil, of very doubtful authority.

Ferte citi flammam, date tela, scandite muros.

Erythraeus, in his learned index to Virgil; though he is a great advocate for the verse as here quoted, acknowledges that all ancient copies are against it; that Macrobius and other grammarians read *et scandite*; that Servius adopts it without the least observation or objection; that Pontanus so read it. I may add that Vida must have so found it in his Virgil, from the manner in which he quotes it in his Poetics. The Variorum editor, compelled, by manuscript authority, gives *et*, as also the Parisian edition before mentioned by me, printed in the year 1520. Is it sufficient against all this to say, that to the moderns the *et* appears to incumber the verse, and to destroy its effect? At all events Virgil has only one verse for the rule, and three against it.

Your correspondent L. endeavours to impeach the authority of Horace, as to metre, by saying, as many others have said before him, that his hexameter verses are not to be concluded as unimpeachable, being *sermoni propiores*. But *sermoni proprior*, in the original, merely refers to the subject of his verses, and not to the verses themselves. He merely says that his subjects are prosaic, and consequently his lines must be destitute of poetic fire; but we are not to conclude from this that he disregarded metre. This is a most absurd supposition. If the case were so, his compositions would be the strangest jumble of inconsistencies that were ever submitted to the world, half verse, half prose. L. ought to produce instances of this neglect of metre, and show that there is somewhat in Horace that cannot be justified by the example of other poets: but this he has not done, nor can do. L. deals more in assertion than any writer I ever read. Poor Ovid, like the rest of his poetical brethren, is attacked in the same mode. L. says, "Ovid utterly disregarded the wholesome severity of metrical jurisprudence;" but this is absolutely contrary to fact. Perhaps L. does not know that Ovid, so far from disregarding metrical rules, apologizes in one of his epistles, de Pont., to a very great friend whom he had known from infancy, for not writing to him, and showing him some mark of his remembrance, because his name, Tuticanus, was inadmissible in verse. It will not be irrelevant to our subject to insert a part of it.

Tuticano.

Quo minus in nostris ponatis, amice, libellis,

Nomini efficitur conditio tui.

Ast ego non alium prius hoc dignarer honore,

Est aliquid nostrum si modo carmen honos

Lex pedis officio, naturaque nominis obstant,
 Quaque meos adens est via nulla modos.
 Nam pudet in geminos ita nomen scindere versus
 Desinat ut prior hoc, incipiatque minor.
 Et pudeat, si te, qua syllaba prima moratur,
 Arctius appellem, Tūticanumque vocem.
 Non potis illi versum Tūticanī more venire,
 Fiat ut e longa syllaba prima brievis.
 Aut producatur quæ nunc corruptius exit,
 Et sit porrecta longa secunda mora,
 His ego si vitiis ausim corrumpere nomen,
 Rideo, et merito pectus habere nego.

It appears from this epistle, that Ovid held metre almost sacred, and thought that nothing could justify a poet in deviating from it.

It may, perhaps, be alleged that some of the authorities against the rule produced from Ovid may be objected to, on the ground of various readings; but at all events many of them must be established. It very clearly appears that some copyer, some librarian, a disciple of Terentianus Mavius, has been tampering with this poet. Who can doubt the authenticity of the following line?

Ante meos oculos tua stat, tua semper imago est.
The alteration made is, *visa est*, instead of *tua stat*. But how flat is this! How violent the alteration! I will mention another line.

Illa sonat raucum, quiddamque inanabile stridet.
Ridet is the various reading; but this is not only contradicted by the best manuscripts, but most incontrovertibly by the context. The line which follows *inanabile stridet*, is,

Ut rudit a scabra turpis asella mola.

Let us examine some other lines:

— *nostri litera scripta memor.*

Ista Mycenæa liteja scripta manu.

Scripta, according to the various readings in both instances, is changed into *facta*, but this is done with every appearance of force and impropriety. There is, however, in Ovid de Trist. l. 5, El. 12, a line to the same purport, to which there appears no various reading.

Carmina scripta mihi sunt nulla, aut qualia cernis.
If *scripta* must stand good in this place, why not in the others? In the following line,

Oraque fontana fei vida spargit aqua.

The various reading is, *pulsat aqua*, which appears scarcely intelligible: *spargit aqua* is the common phrase of Ovid. Upon the whole, if any one will attentively consider the various readings, and at the same time consult the text, he will be convinced that few or none of them can stand their ground, and that, upon the whole, Ovid must be considered as a most powerful, incontrovertible, and

decided authority against the rule; and if its advocates have nothing to advance, but merely a gratis dictum that the best versifier in the Latin language did not observe, or regard the laws of metre, their cause is in a desperate situation. If the authority of any ancient poet can with reason be objected to, it is that of Virgil, who left his great work imperfect; so much so, in his own opinion, that he requested it to be destroyed. Ovid, on the contrary, is so confident of the excellence of his great work, that he defies even Jove himself to destroy it. Ovid, in my humble opinion, is a better versifier than Virgil; I do not say poet; his verses abound much less in elisions. I never can think that elisions add to the harmony of verse. Ovid, though well acquainted with Virgilian verse, never chose to imitate it. There are several lines in Virgil, for the metre of which grammarians do not satisfactorily account, such as the following:

Posthabita coluisse Samo, hic illius arma.
 Et succus pecori et lac subducitur agnis.
 Et vera incessu patuit Dea; ille ubi matrem.
 Stant et juniperi et castaneæ hirsutæ.
 Clamassent et littus Hila, Hila omne sonaret.
 Nomen et arma locum servant, te, amice nequivi.
 Credimus? an qui amant ipsi sibi somnia fingunt.
 Rumpe moras omnes turbataque arripe castra.

Are these mistakes, or only defensible licences? No modern, I am sure, would venture to copy them. There are, however, other lines seemingly contrary to the laws of prosody, which can now be well accounted for, on the ground of Professor Dunbar's learned, ingenious, and satisfactory discovery of the principle of Homeric versification, which is equally applicable to Latin hexameters, and was certainly adopted from Homer, by Virgil and other Latin writers. The principle is, that a syllable naturally short may be made long by being the first syllable of a foot, the arsis, or metrical ictus, or cæsural syllable, call it which you please, resting upon it. All the Virgilian lines ending in *or*, *it*, *bus*, or any other consonant which would be naturally short before a vowel, may thus be lengthened; and even a short vowel may be lengthened. We shall have no difficulty, in future, in accounting for such licences as the following: *Omnia vincit amor et nos*; *Gravidus autumnus*; *Pectoribus inhians*; *Caput Evandrius abstulit ensis*; *Canit Hymenaeos*; *Fultus Hyacintho*; *Auro graviā sectoque Elephanto*; *Liminaqüe laurusque*; *Ensemqüe clypeumque*; *Fontesqüe fluviosque*, &c. &c. Of such lines I should not think there were fewer than fifty in Virgil. I do not here mean to say that the force of the cæsural syllable in Latin verse is now first discovered; but that there was always an outcry against any modern who laid claim to the licence; false quantity! false quantity! was echoed from all

quarters, and this metrical license was always received with coldness, and a timid, half kind of assent. But as it is now shown that Homeric versification is founded on this principle, which Virgil and others adopted, the practice will henceforward rest on a firm foundation. This I am happy to say is a rule of liberty, not of restriction, such as I am now combating: but I must confess that restriction appears to be the order of the day. Although on this occasion I earnestly declare for this liberty of the caesural syllable, I admit it to be contrary to the general laws of Latin prosody, and that it ought to be used with moderation and discretion.

I must now add a few words on Catullus. As to the opinion of L. that we are to look up to this writer as a principal authority in metre, I fancy that very few will be disposed to coincide in it. Catullus laid down a rule to himself, as has been before observed, to which no other Roman poet ever paid the least attention, but contradicted in every ten lines. His pentameter verses offend against every rule regarded by other elegiac poets. Take a specimen of them:

Troja virsum et virtutum omnium acerba cinis.

Illam affligit odore, iste perit podagra.

Aut facere haec a te dictaque factaque sunt.

There ought, at least, to be a pause at the end of every pentameter verse; the sense ought not to run into the ensuing hexameter, according to the Grecian mode. To this Catullus pays no regard.

Nunquam ego te, vitâ frater amabilior

Aspiciam ī _____

Quo mea se molli candida Diva pede

Intulit ? _____

The polysyllabic terminations of the Greek pentameter are hardly tolerable in Latin, and have been studiously avoided by Ovid and Tibullus, whereas the terminations of the pentameters of Catullus are in general of this sort.

Catullus makes the first syllable in *juverint* short, an instance of which can be found in no other writer.

* Non, ita me Divi, vera gemunt, jūverint. Poem. 64. v. 18.

His short poems in hexameter and pentameter verse have little merit, and are in general on offensive subjects. So that in every point of view I think Catullus must be objected to as authority.

Having, I trust, shown that the great classical poets disregarded the alleged metrical canon, let us examine the authority on which it at present rests.

The old grammarians differ so much from one another on the subject, as has been shown by your correspondent in your 19th No., that nothing to be depended on can be elicited from them. The

great Terentianus Maurus then is to determine the question. But who is Terentianus Maurus? In what age did he live? I can find no account of him in Bayle, or Sir Th. Blount. Until this point is settled, he is no authority whatever. On consulting Harwood, I am informed that the first edition of his work appeared in the year 1497. Probably he is not more ancient than the date of his work, and is to be classed among those writers, who, on the revival of letters in the 15th century, when manuscripts of ancient writers were in high request, endeavoured to palm himself on the world in the light of an ancient. I think it incumbent on his patrons to give us some reason for their veneration of him. I have not this writer at present by me, but I take his position from the verses as quoted by your correspondent in the 19th No. of your Journal. The meaning of his verses appears to me obscure and contradictory. I am, however, content, that his patrons should elicit that metrical rule from him, which has hitherto been the subject of this essay. In the first place, then, he lays down a rule which the writings of the ancients almost entirely contradict, and to support which no sufficient instances can be produced. Secondly, in the short quotation from him in your Journal, he manifestly shows himself ignorant in a matter in which a writer on metre ought to be particularly conversant: he says, that Virgil makes a false quantity when he writes, *solus hic inflexit sensus*. But this is not the only place in which Virgil makes *hic* short before a vowel. He begins a very memorable line thus—*Hic vir, hic est*, &c. I believe, there is no doubt that other writers make *hic* short.

Terentianus Maurus says that the line in Virgil, *Insulae Ionio in magno*, &c. is a false quantity; to other critics of great name the verse appears defensible. These instances are sufficient to show that Terentianus Maurus is not infallible in all his positions. Other objections might be made, without doubt, to his doctrines, if any one thought it worth while to scrutinise them. Dawes supports the doctrine of Terentianus Maurus: Dawes was undoubtedly a very learned man, and, as a Grecian, of Porsonian stature, but as a Latin scholar, he can claim no pre-eminence over others. It must be admitted that he was very positive, and very dogmatical, no very excellent qualities in a critic. However, *valde ejus auctoritas quantum valere potest*. Bentley and Tyrwhitt knew of no such doctrine. Dr. Symmons, in his defence of Milton's Latin poetry, (that such poetry should be defamed! that men of learning should think it necessary to come forward against his pigmy critics!) intimates to us, that the learned Dr. Parr, a friend of liberty and the Muses, supports the Dawesian system. But it is no great symptom of his regard for it, that he furnishes his friend with instances against it. I shall not, however, give im-

plicit credit to this information, until I see it confirmed under his hand. I should like very much to see the subject of Latin metre discussed by Dr. Parr; I wish some potent voice could rouse this venerable and recumbent lion, this sovereign of the forest, from his den.

The men of Eton certainly defend one of their own canons, and I do not hesitate to acknowledge the weight due to them. But the men of Westminster and Winchester not only deny this, but the two other Etonian canons, as their poetical compositions sufficiently testify. I believe few impartial men will admit that either of these schools should concede the palm to Eton. The editors of the Portroyal Latin Grammat, most pre-eminent scholars, deny any kind of authority to this *sp.* rule. All the Italian, German, Dutch, and English writers of Latin verse, treat it with contempt. To say all that need be said, in one word—the two first seats of learning and the Muses which the world can boast, the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford, pay no regard to any of the metrical canons which I controvert. They both annually give premiums to those who excel in Latin poetry, and reject no man's verses for non-adherence to them, as is sufficiently apparent from the prize poems published at both the Universities.

I come now to the second canon, that such words as *servitii*, *consilii*, *officii*, *imperii*, *navigii*, are not to be admitted in the genitive case as words of four syllables. I do not know whether the supporters of this canon admit words of the nominative case ending in *i* to be of four syllables, but I take for granted that they do not. It is very difficult to know what to say on the subject, because no one of the supporters of this extraordinary metrical canon has condescended to inform us on what ground it is founded. I know of no Roman writers who observe it. L., in his dictatorial manner, says words of this kind can only be allowed in a pentameter verse. But why so? I could fill pages with instances where they are used in hexameters. Ovid, the best of all authorities, introduces them in all parts of his numerous works. It is needless to make collections of them from him, and other writers. I shall quote two or three lines from memory.

Hosne mihi fructus, hunc fertilitatis honorem

'Officium' refers? ——————

Nullum servitii signum cervice gerentem.

I recollect a line of this sort of five syllables—

Arte superciliis confinia nuda repletis.

Horace has —————— *Mæoniis* carminis alite.

Virgil has —————— *Naryciis* posuerunt mœnia Locri.

These instances occur to me whilst writing, I do not think it necessary to add more, until I learn the ground on which the canon is founded. Horace, certainly, in his lyrical compositions, contracts

several words of this stamp, as *imperī*, *consili*, *Pompilī*, *Tarquinī*. The license is here in the contraction, making a word properly of four syllables, only of three. Why Horace does so, is obvious. Words so contracted are more suitable to lyrical compositions; unless so contracted they could not find a place in Iambics, but if so contracted, they could not be used in hexameters. These words are by poets made suitable to the different metres in which they write. There are, however, many of this sort of words, of the contraction of which no instances can be produced. I never heard of *officī*, *navigī*. I doubt whether the supporters of the system would contract words for which they could produce no authority. It has been said, that there can no instance be produced of classical authority making *imperii* of four syllables. I have lately been reading Juvenal, and can assert, that it is to be found three times in his Satires. Ovid, I recollect, has this line—

Non sunt imperii tamen fera jussa mei.

But all words of this kind stand upon the same footing, and though any particular word might not be found in a classical author, it would not follow from thence, that it was not authorised, because four syllables are the legitimate number, and the admission of only three is the license. Upon the same ground that you object to making *imperii* of four syllables, it appears to me that you might object to such words as *fluvii*, *gladii*, *radii*, being three. The loss of such a large class of words in hexameters as those in question would occasion many unnecessary difficulties. I think I may now dismiss this canon.

Let us now come to the third, that the letter *o* ought not to be used as a short vowel, when scanned with another short vowel. For instance, *tendō chalybīn*, *caligō futuri*, *farragō libelti*, &c.

It cannot be denied, that words ending in *o* are made short by all Romans where *o* concludes the foot—*nunc scio*, *nunc volo*, *at voto*, *sentio*, *nescio*, &c. &c. Your correspondent, in the 19th No. of your Journal, furnishes me with one line from Ovid, which contradicts the canon.

Ingenio formæ damna rependo mea.

I have looked for ten minutes into Ovid, and find, in one of his most finished poems, that, de arte Am., the following verses:

Adjice præceptis hōc quoque, Naso,⁴ tuis.

Pollicitusque favens vulgus adesto meis.

—Naso magister' erāt.

Collige, vel digitis en ego tollo meis.

Horace has—*Aliquando bonus dormitat Homerus.*

There cannot be the least doubt that *o* is common; but I admit

⁴ No one doubts that *o* is common in Nominatives, and of course in Vocatives. EDIT.

that Virgil and Ovid rarely made it short in the manner mentioned in the above canon; although the later poets did, but I contend, nevertheless, that this is no reason for the moderns to abstain from the practice in question.

It is well known that not only language, but the pronunciation of it, alters in the course of time. No language altered more rapidly than the Latin. It is clear, that the pronunciation of it changed very much from the time of Lucretius to that of Virgil. The letter *s* gave no offence to Lucretius, whereas it has been observed that Virgil avoided ending a word with this letter, and beginning the following with the same. Each particular poet has his peculiar fancy and caprice in the construction of his verse, as observed in those of Catullus, Virgil, and Martial. All poets, in all ages, have had peculiarities of this sort. But their contemporaries or successors are not bound to follow the caprices, even of the best poets. That the observance of seldom making the *o* short by Virgil in the manner mentioned in the rule, arose probably from some singularity of opinion, or from the pronunciation of the day, is manifest from the total rejection of it by succeeding poets. Ovid, too, an Augustan writer, shows by his own practice its admissibility. Statius, Juvenal, and Martial, make *o* short in every page; they were all as well acquainted with the writings of Virgil as we are, admired him as much, knew his practice as well, yet even his example and authority had no influence on them. Juvenal idolised Virgil, he refers frequently to him in his Satires.—He thus compliments him:

Conditor Iliados cantabitur, atque Maronis
Altisoni dubiam facientia carmina palmam. Sat. xi.

People are often induced by fashion, or by admiration of a person, to imitate that for which there is no substantial reason. But no motive of this kind operated on any of the later writers. I conclude, from the whole, that Virgil was merely guided by his ear, and the pronunciation of his time, in this matter. But as the pronunciation of Latin is lost, and must have been different at different periods, I contend that the moderns have nothing to do with niceties of this sort, and that, in the present instance, they are at full liberty to follow the example of the later poets, especially in a practice which no age forbade. One of the Latin Fathers asserts, that if the word *primus*, in the first line of Virgil's Æneid, had ended in *is*, (suppose the word *tristis*) it would have offended the ears of the old Romans; but if this assertion be well founded, which I much doubt, I know not what metrical rule is to be drawn from it. We can merely say it is a nicety of which the moderns have no notion.

I admit, as a good metrical rule, that enclitics should be joined

to the first word of a clause,' but even this rule is very frequently offended against by Ovid and Tibullus in pentameter verses.

- jactatas excutiatque faces. Ovid de gr. Aman. l. 1
- in medios desiluitque rogos. l. 1.
- tam sero cur veniatque iogat. l. 1,
- Cura fugit, multo diluiturque mero. l. 1.

Upon the whole, I think it unwise in the moderns to throw stumbling-blocks in the way of Latin composition, to lay down metrical laws which are very disputable. The old Romans will not rise from their graves to condemn us—the moderns must be content to be ignorant of Roman pronunciation. I must, for my own part, declare that I detest those minute, captious, illiberal, word-catching critics, who are never pleased but when they can find fault. If the Latin verses of a modern are written in the true spirit of poetry, be harmonious, not too much encumbered with spondees and elisions, and the latinity of them be good, they must give pleasure to every classical reader, notwithstanding any trifling metrical lapse. The critics of the present times appear to read modern Latin poetry, not with any view to be pleased, but merely to discover some lapse. L. mentions some excellent Latin poet, and learned man, who made *u* in *salubris* short; this, in the opinion of L., counterbalances all excellencies, and condemns the poet for ever. Terentianus Maurus maintains that Virgil has made false quantities, and every poet who ever wrote has committed many and great errors. I require verses to be read with a liberal spirit; give due commendation to good verses; gently hint any lapse which may appear; do not expect perfection; nothing is more easily rectified than an error in metre; a man who has a facility in making Latin verses, can turn a sentence twenty different ways. I shall only add, that writing Latin verses must be deemed a liberal entertainment either in young or old, at least by those who read the Classical Journal, or write in it. It would be a matter to be lamented, that a person who can write such excellent Latin verses as Mr. Lonsdale, an Etonian, and many others, whose poems appear in your Journals, should not continue the practice in more advanced life, for really our present English poets are not intitled to very high praise. The Hobgoblin, and the cloud-capt, Indo-mythological, poets of these days are above the reach of classical readers, they are intelligible only to the female part of the world.

ANTI-MAURUS.

¹ See Class. Journ. Vol. IX. 587.

NOTICE OF

A GRAMMAR of the GREEK TONGUE, on a new plan.
By JOHN JONES, 3d Edition, 1815, 12mo.

THIS philosophical, and yet sufficiently practical, Grammar, is now presented to the Public in a more acceptable form, and the improvements which it has undergone in this, the third edition cannot be better stated than in Mr. Jones's own words:—

“ Much remote, and less practical, matter, has been excluded and the volume is solely occupied in detailing the parts of speech, and the rules of syntax. The formation of the moods and tenses, a subject so complicated in this tongue, is given at great length; and the fulness of the detail, though it may appear formidable, instead of incumbering, will be found to aid the memory. The difficulty attending verbs in $\mu\acute{\iota}$ is universally felt by learners. The manner of treating that branch of the Greek verb is peculiar to this Grammar. The expediency of resolving the *four* classes into *one* common model, of reducing the tenses into *two*, *present* and *past*, and of deriving so great a variety of terminations from a few invariable rules of contraction, will for the future render the learning of these verbs an easy and agreeable task. Indeed, so great is the felicity of the subject, that no elementary work in Greek, or any other language, can present so happy a specimen of grammatical analysis.”

“ To this edition is annexed, what is wanting in the two former, a plate of *Abbreviations*. And here the writer would recommend, as a necessary and elegant attainment to those who would understand the Greek language, the art of drawing its characters with neatness and precision. Mr. Hodgkin, a respectable man, and useful teacher, has labored to diffuse this accomplishment: the rules and plates which he has published for this purpose, ought to be in the hands of all school-masters.”*

Our limits on the present occasion will not permit us to enter on that copious analysis of this excellent little work, which we had meditated, and we are reluctantly compelled to content ourselves with one or two extracts.

In page 200, Mr. Jones remarks, that “ learned men have asserted, that in some places $\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\iota$ conveys the same precise sense with $\varsigma\mu\acute{\iota}$, vid. Callim. in Jov. 20. But it carries the additional idea of being *proclaimed* or *celebrated*, *viz.* $\theta\alpha\mu\chi\alpha\lambda\epsilon\omega\mu\alpha\iota$, *they shall be called*, i. e. *they shall be announced as such before*

* The Plates have been inserted in our former Nos. Ed.

an assembled universe. Juno reminds Jupiter of her rank, by telling him, *τη παρακούσις κελημαί, I am called*, i. e. celebrated to fame as thy consort."

This observation was, we believe, first made by the writer of the article on Professor Monk's edition of the *Hippolytus*, inserted in the *British Critic*, and it has been subsequently confirmed in some notices of the same work, which appeared in the *Classical Journal*, where we have the additional remark, that *καλεομαί* never can be used but with persons.

As much has been lately said in the *Classical Journal on the Doctrine of the Association of Ideas*, as applicable to the illustration of language, we shall quote what Mr. J. says upon the subject; for, as Mr. Walter WHITER was the first who endeavoured to explain any English writer by this means, so Mr. J. seems to have been the first, who has employed this principle of association to elucidate the Greek and Roman writers.

"Association may be considered as influencing the government of words, or the choice of words, or the meaning of words.

Association influences the government of words. This influence, styled by Grammarians *Attraction*, sometimes causes a noun, in consequence of its proximity to a transitive verb, to be put in the accusative, which should more regularly be used in the nominative, in connexion with the succeeding verb. Οἰδα σε τις ει, Mark i. 24. *I know thee who thou art*, for οἰδα τις ει συ, *I know who thou art*. Ὁγας την θεων ισχυν δοη, *you see the power of the gods*, how great it is, for ογας δοη εστι ἡ των θεων ισχυς, *you see how great is the power of the gods*. Ουκ εστιν ἡγεινα πωποτε ουκ ηρξεν αεχην, *there is not what public office he did not sustain*, for ουκ εστιν αεχην, *there is not what public office there is no public office, which he did not sustain*.

Φημι κατανευσαι Κρονιανα, &c.—αστραπτων επιδεξια, Il. ii. 350. *I assert that Jupiter, flashing out auspicious omens, for κατηνευσε, or δι τι κατηνευσ Κρονιων. Τον λογον δν απεστειλε τοις νιοις Ισραηλ ευαγγελιζομενος ειρηνην δια Ιησου Χριστου, αύτος εστι παντων κυριος.* Acts x. 36. *the word which God sent to the children of Israel, preaching peace through Jesus Christ, this is the lord of all—τον λογον, attracted by απεστειλε, instead of δ λογος the nominative to εστι, this word is lord of all; meaning that the Christian doctrine was not, as at first supposed, to be confined to the Jews, but to extend to all nations, and to acquire a sovereign authority in the breasts of men.* Τον αγρον δν κλαμεν, ουχι κοινωνια του σωματος, του Χριστου εστι, Cor. ix. 16. *Is not the bread we break a parti-*

pation of the body of Christ—τὸν αὐτὸν for δι' αὐτοῦ. Vide Matthew xxi. 42, where a similar attraction occurs.

On the other hand, a noun, which should more regularly be in the accusative, is used in the nominative, attracted by the subject of a preceding verb.

Ευχέτας οὐγίς γενεσθαι, she prayed to become a bird—ογν, for ογνίδια. Μοι οροστὸν προφέρων αργῆσειν, being ready to defend me, swear (that)—for πρόφρονα αργῆσειν, swear that you are ready to defend me. Μη τῷ οἰκείῳ εἶναι πιστεύων αμελή, not to neglect (his relations) confiding (for respect and affection) in being a relative—οἰκείος, attracted by αμελή, for οἰκείον in connection with εἶναι.

In the following, and such other examples, the construction is perfectly correct and regular. *Καὶ ἀμά ποθομην αὐτῶν ἔια τῷ πιητῷ οἰομένων καὶ τ' αλλὰ σοφωτάτον εἶναι αὐθαπτών, Plato's defence of Socrates, I. at the same time perceived from them, (meaning the poets) thinking themselves, on account of their poetry, the wisest of men in other things.* Here the whole clause is in the genitive, as expressing the origin of what Socrates perceived; οἰομένων being used participially in the sense of the infinitive, and σοφωτάτων put necessarily in the same case as predicate to αὐτῶν, οἰομένων. Nevertheless an English writer would have said, *I perceive that, because of their poetical talents, they suppose themselves to be the wisest of men also in other subjects—αὐτοὺς οἴοντας σοφωτάτους εἶναι αὐθωπτών. Μοι χρειαστού εστι μαθῆτη σὺ γενεσθαι, It is most eligible for me to become thy disciple.* Here again, μοι means the same person with μαθῆτη, and therefore with the strictest propriety put in the same case. The whole clause is the subject to εστι. Thus, *for me to become thy disciple is most eligible.* See the Index of Forster's Plato under the word *genitivum*.

Καὶ τὴν νῦν πορπάταν ασφαλῶς, οὐα

Μαθῆ σοφιστῆς αὐτὸν Διος γαθεστέρος. Prometheus Vinctus. 61.

And now clasp this sceptre, that being a craftsman, less quick than Jove, he might learn, namely, that he is so; αὐτόν being attracted by σοφιστῆς to agree with it as a participle, instead of being the infinitive εἶναι after μαθῆ.

In the same Play, line 200, we read,

Στασίς τ' εν αλληλοισιν αρρώνυετο

Οἱ μεν θελοντες εκβαλλειν ἦρας Κρονον,

Ως ζευς αναστοι δηθεν, οἱ σε τουμπαλιν

Σπειδοντες ως ζευς μητετε αρξαντειν θεον.

A dispute arose among themselves: some of the gods, being desirous of expelling Saturn from his throne, that Jupiter might reign; others, on the contrary, urging that Jupiter should not rule the gods.

The nominatives of μετε—οἱ θεοι, which critics call nominativi con-

26 Notice of J. Jones's Greek Grammar.

sequentiae, have no corresponding verb: but the anomaly proceeded from the writer's taking, by association, στασις, *dispute*, for the gods, δαιμones; *disputing*; as though he had written, δαιμones στασιζοντες εν αληλοισιν αροβινογτο, οι μεν, &c.

A noun, that should be in the genitive or dative, is often changed to the accusative, attracted by an infinitive verb.

Thus Thucydides—Ἄνδρας γαρ σωφρονει μεν εστι, ει μη αδικοιντες ηγουμαζειν αγαθων δε αδικουμενους, εκ μεν ειρηνης πολεμειν, ευ δε παρασχον εκ πολεμου παλιν συμβηναι, it is the part of moderate men to live peacefully, if they are not injuriously treated; but of brave men, when injustice is done them, out of peace to make war, and being successful, out of war to make peace—αδικουμενους in reference to πολεμειν, and not αδικουμενων agreeing with αγαθων. Sophocles, Elec. 995, writes, παρεστι μεν (σοι) στενει πλαισου πατερων κηπων επτεπημενη παρεστι δε αλγειν αλεκτρα γηρασκουσαν, it awaits thee deprived of thy father's inheritance to sigh; it awaits thee growing old without a home to grieve. See verse 480 of the same Play, also the Crito of Plato, Sec. 13.

The relative, instead of being the accusative after its governing verb, often assumes, in consequence of attraction, the case of its antecedent.

Χρωμαι οις εχω, I use the means which I possess, for χρωμαι αιχω. Επιστενει τω λογω, ω ειπεν δι Ιησους, he believed the word which Jesus said, John iv. 50. ω ειπεν for δι ειπεν. Μεμνομενος ων επειξεν, remembering the things which he did; for μεμνομενος των πραγματων, δ επειξεν.

The influence of association causes a term prominent in the mind of the writer to be used absolutely in the nominative at the beginning of a sentence, though a more regular arrangement of his ideas required it to be placed at the close of one of the oblique cases.

Thus, Gold, they shall not delight in it, for, they shall not delight in gold, Isaiah xiii. 18, He, who conquers and preserves my works to the end, TO ηιμ I will give authority, &c. Rev. ii. 26. δι γικων και τηρω μεχρι τελους τα εργα μου, διωσ αυτω εξουσιαν, for αυτω τη γικωντι, &c. διωσ εξουσιαν. So also writes Homer, Il. vi. 510. when comparing the swiftness, with which Paris flew from the citadel to the embattled plains, to the velocity with which a well-fed horse escapes from the stall to the frequented meads.

'Ο δι αγλαιηφι πεποιθεσ

Πιρφα ε γουνα φεσι μετα τη θεα και νομον ιππων,
But he priding in his beauty, his limbs rapidly conveyed him to
the accustomed pasture of the horses, for του δι αγλαιηφι πεποιθεσ
γουνα, &c. the limbs of him priding in his beauty, &c.

To this may be referred such examples as the following—

Πολλη γας (ἢ στρατια) ουσα, εν πασης εσται πολεως ψευδεξασθαι,
Thucyd. the army being numerous, it will not be in the power of
every city to accommodate them. In strict propriety the historian
should have written, πολλης γας της στρατιας ουτης, or ετει γας
πολλη ἡ στρατια ην, since the army was numerous.

Homer should thus have described the horses of *Rhegas*: Του δη
ιπποι καλλιστοι, αν ιδον, ηδε μεγιστοι; λευκοτεροι χιονος, βασιν δ' ανεροισι
δμοιοι, The horses of this man were the handsomest and largest I.
have ever seen, being whiter than snow, and like the wind in swift-
ness. But instead of this he says, του δε, καλλιστους ιππους ιδον,
ηδε μεγιστους, λευκοτεροι χιονος, &c. Il. x. 430. The same poet
was going to say, Νυν δ' αυ τους, οσοι το Πελασγικον Αργος εγεροντο
&c. αρχει Αχιλλευς, Achilles commanded those who inhabited the
Pelasgic Argos. But in the room of this, he writes, νυν δ' αυ τους,
οσοι το Πελασγικον Αργος εγεροντο, &c. των αυ πεντηκοντα νεων ην
αρχος Αχιλλευς, Il. ii. 681—685."

As to the instance adduced from the *Prometheus Vinctus*, v. 61.,
Mr. J. cannot be ignorant that Mr. Barker has, with what success
we pretend not to determine, in the *Class. Journ.* endeavoured to
demonstrate in two or three articles, to which *Sidneyensis* has
replied, that the passage is capable of a different interpretation,
viz. "That he may know that, cunning as he is, he is not so cu-
ning as Jupiter." To these papers we refer both Mr. J. and
our readers.

NOTICE OF
ANACREONTIS CARMINA. Accedunt quædam e LYRICO-
RUM RELIQUIIS. E recensione et cum notis Rich. Fr.
Phil. BRUNCKII, Edidit God. Henr. SCHAEFER.
Lipsiæ. 1811. 24mo. pp. xv + 100 = 115.

THIS little work is part of a "Corpus Poetarum Græcorum;"
which, as our readers are probably aware, Schaefer, the industrious
German, is editing, "ad fidem optimorum librorum." As it is
merely a reprint of Brunck's edition, the merits of which are well
known among scholars, it will not be necessary to make any
critical remarks on the text; we shall therefore content ourselves
with transcribing from the preface some emendations which the
editor has made in the text of the small edition of Euripides,

which was published at the same time with Anacreon and Xenophon.
“ Euripid. Electr. v. 256. vulgo legitur.

ἄγνευμά ἔχων τί θεῖον, ή σ' ἀναξιῶν;

Hinc verbum *ἀναξιῶν*, ceteris lexicographis omisso sum, Schneiderus ascivit. Sed ego hoc verbum græcum esse nego. Itaque dedit: *ἄρης ἔχει θεῖον ή σ' ἀπαξιῶν*; Sic confusa in Diog. Laert. vii. 105. *ἀναξιῶν et ἀπαξιῶν*. V. Addenda ad Gregor. Corinth. p. 922. Ibid. v. 306. Editiones habent:

πέπλοις μὲν, οἷοις ἐν πέπλοις αὐλίζομαι.

Scripsi: *πρ. μοῖς; ἐν πέπλ. στολίζομαι.* Sic Carm. Anacreont. xxviii. v. 29. sqq. Στόλισον τὸ λοιπὸν αὐτὴν ὑποπορφύρησι πέπλοις. Ipse Euripides voce στολιδὸς de πέπλοις aliquoties usus est.

Ion. v. 297.: τιμᾶ, τιμῆ, ὡς μὴ τοῦ ἀφελόν σ' εἰσιδεῖν. Fœde corruptum hunc versum (v. Porson. supplem. præfat. ad Hecub. p. xxiv. Lips.) sic mihi videor ad saniorem rationem revocasse:

ἄτιμα τιμῆ, μήποτ' ἀφελόν σφ' ἰδεῖν.—Conf. v. 299.

Iphig. Aul. v. 448. sqq.: καὶ γὰρ δακρύσαι ραδίως αὐτοῖς ἔχει, *Αὐολβα τ' εἰπεῖν, τῷ δὲ γενναιῷ φύσιν ἀπαντα ταῦτα.*

Primam vocem postremi versus, quam nemo facile dubitet vitium contraxisse, viri docti variis conjecturis emendare conati sunt. Mihi visa est mutanda esse in *ἀναντα. difficilia.* Opponitur ραδίως ἔχει. Suidas: *Ἀναντα—δυστχερῆ.* Ceterum literas γ et π sacerissime confusa esse a scribis, docetur pluribus locis in nova editione Gregorii Corinthii. Vid. p. 716. 726. 730. 747. et 922. Ibid. v. 907.: ἐπὶ τίνος σπουδαστέον μοι μᾶλλον, ή τέχνου πέρι; Sic vulgo editum est. Sed exitus hujus versus satis docet, etiam initio scribendum fuisse περὶ τίνος. Adde quod frequentissima est confusio præpositionum ἐπὶ et περὶ, cuius causam indicavit præstantissimus Bastius, his literis ante paucos dies immaturo lugubrique fato eruptus, in Commentat. Palæograph. p. 783. ubi in Mythographi loco vere me corressisse ὠξοκαινοτομοῦσαν περὶ τὰ θεῖα, nemo dubitat, qui contulerit hunc Platonis Euthyphr. c. 2. p. 12. Ed. Fisch. ὡς οὖν καινοτομοῦντός σου περὶ τὰ θεῖα. Similiter Xenoph. Hellen. vi. 2. 16. καὶ περὶ τοὺς μιθοφόρους ἐκαινούγγει. In Scholiis Tzetzarum ad Lycophron. v. 683. pro vulg. παρὰ Τιρεσίου e codicibus Vitebergensibus Müllero nostro dare placuit περὶ Τιρεσίου: Sane hoc propius verum est: nam Scholiasta scripsit ἐπὶ Τιρεσίου, *judice Tiresia.* Sic Plutarch. Mor. T. i. p. 711. Wytt. Πρεσβύτερος δὲ πενιχρᾶς ἀξιούσης, ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καθηγεῖται, x. τ. λ.

Rhes. v. 115.:—νικώμενος μὲν, τήνδε μὴ μόλης πόλιν. Recte vertunt: *non poteris redire.* Sed hic sensus ut existeret, debebant scribere, ut ego scripsi:

νικώμενος μὲν, τήνδε μὴ οὐ μόλης πόλιν.

Multis ille bonis flebilis occidit:
Nulli flebilius quam mihi.

Obiter moneo, in antecedentibus v. 110. φύγειν non esse cum Musgravio solicitandum. Verte: adeo inflatus es, ut opineris, Græcos fugere. Prægnans enim hic vis est verbi ἐξίρροθαι: quapropter infinitivus φύγειν recte sequitur. Xenophon Hellen. iv. 5—12. κατεφόνου δὲ διὰ τὰς ἐμπροσθετάς τύχας, μηδένα ἀντιχειρῆσαι σφίσιν. ubi cum nonnullis visum esset post τύχας inseri oportere participium οἰόμενοι, unde penderet infinitivus ἐπιχειρῆσαι, vere monuit criticus eximius in Addend. edit., Schneider. p. 121. κατεφόνου h. l. esse καταφρονητικῶς ὄντο. Ibid. v. 4, 45. μάλα πρόσθεν μάγα φρονῶντες μὴ ὑπελέγειν τοῖς Θηβαῖοις; quod Leunclavius bene vertit, quamquam—*prius clatis animis se minime Thebanis cessuros existimassent.*

Troad. v. 554.: ἔνωκεν παρ' ὕπνῳ. De vitio vocis ὕπνῳ viri docti consentiunt: dissentient de medela. Ego edidi: ἔνωκεν παρ' ἀνῷ, memor confusionis horum nominum, cujus exempla dedi in not. ad Plin. Epistol. p. 145. b. et in præfat. p. xiv. His nunc addo var. lect. ad Eurip. Cyclop. v. 589. et Reiz. ad Aristotel. Polit. p. 74. (coll. V. D. *in der Neuen Philol. Biblioth.* iii. p. 185. et Schneider. ad Aristotel. Polit. p. 456.) Ceterum eandem loci Troadum emendandi rationem video placuisse Erfurdtio ad Sophocl. OEd. R. v. 773. p. 110. ed. minor." Schaefer. Præf. pp. viii—xii.

Schaefer does not profess to have made any emendations of Anacreon's or the other Poems contained in this neat little volume: " nihil mihi, specimen typographica legenti, nisi passim in accentus, interpunctionem similaresque minutissimis, licere arbitratus sum." Præf. p. vii. At the bottom of the page, however, he proposes, what we are disposed to think an ingenious emendation of one passage: it is as follows.

"P. 67. in Aristotelis Pœani versus penultimus fortasse sic scribendum: Αἰδος Εενίου σέβας ἀζουσαι: ut hic etiam, quod toties factum, α et αυ, ζ et ξ confusæ videantur. Quod si recte conject, alterum h. l. exempluin habemus activi ἀ ζ ω. Σέβας ἀξει autem dicitur, ut σέβας ἐταιεισθαι s. καταιεισθαι. V. Porson. ad Euripid. Med. v. 750."

We shall probably, at some future time, consider Schaefer's small editions of the other Greek writers.—The present work seems very correctly printed as far as we have seen: and, as might be expected from a modern production of the Leipzig press, is most beautifully executed. It is an admirable substitute for Brunck's editions, which are all scarce: the text is, we think, in several cases improved by alterations of the punctuation: and it possesses another advantage, which is, that, while Brunck's Anacreon sells for half a guinea, this may be procured for the trifling sum of three shillings.

OBSERVATIONES CRITICÆ IN EURIPIDEM.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

IN the year 1799 a duodecimo edition of the *Cyclops* was printed at Nuremberg. To this little volume are subjoined a few critical observations by the Editor, M. George Frideric Daniel Goes. As the work is extremely scarce, and the notes contain some useful matter, I have been at the pains to transcribe them for the use of your *Journal*, in which so many scarce and valuable tracts have been judiciously reprinted. The text is the same with that of Hoepfner, Lips. 1789.

1814. L. C.

Vers. 15. De verbo λαβὼν Jacobs V. Cel. in animadversiōnibus in Euripidis trag. et frag. tom. 1. pag. 119. hæc scribit: satis quidem expedita sententia, Silenum ad navis gubernaculum consedisse; sed in verbis hæremus. Δόγμα enim, non quod Heathius voluit, clavum gubernaculi, sed ipsam navem significare, satis cum ex aliis locis, tum ex Euripidis Helena vers. 1584. adpareat, ubi est: ἐξέπεισεν εἰσθῆναι δόγμα, et in ipso Cyclope, v. 19. δόγμα, quod nemo facile de gubernaculo intelliget; neque tamen verisimile est poetam idem verbum intra tam paucorum verborum spatiū tam diverso significatu adhibuisse. Quæ cùm ita sint, difficile dictu est, quo v. λαβὼν referendum sit, quod cum v. δόγμα conjungi nequit. His rationibus ductus λαβὼν in mendo cubare suspicor, et corrigendum: θακῶ..¹ Vocabulum δόγμα, 1) significat hastam, 2) omne lignum, in primis nauticum, 3) navigium ipsum: proinde δόγμα vere significare posset ex sententia Heathii clavum gubernaculi. Nec minus plura exempla, quæ hic enumerare supersedeo, quemque edocent, eadem verba omnino intra paucum spatiū apud vet. poetas occurtere. Evidem v. λαβὼν ad ἀμφῆς referendum esse, navigium significans quod utrinque semis impellitur, arbitror et vulgatam lectionem satis probam amplictens ita interpretor verba: *Ipse in extremâ puppi gubernaculum tenens navem regebam.*

Vers. 30. Cel. Jacobs non negat quidem, sensum quod attinet, lectionem vulgatam defendi posse: attamen tentavit pro μένων—δάμων, quod ejus ex sententia proxime a vulgata abest, neque exemplo caret vers. 118., et Iphigen. in T. 949. οῖκων ὅντες ἐν ταυτῷ στέγαι, nec non Catull. carm. lxiv. 247. sive etiam μελάθρων, quod cum per compendium sic scribcretur μέλων, facile in μένων abire potuit. Sic Alcest. 247. μελάθρων στέγαι. Ingeniosam vel hanc esse amicissimi Jacobs conjecturam, nemo negabit, licet non satis intelligatur, cur a vulgata lectione recedendum sit, quæ utique Sileni conditionem significantius exprimit, qui manens

¹ Haec conjectura metro repugnat.

*juspus est, scopis verrere et alveos implere, unde pecora bibant,
quæ filii pascere licitum est.*

Vers. 39. Florens Christianus ingeniose, sed sine omni causa legit: κάμη, quod nec Barnesio ineptum visum est, adque Silenum esset trahendum, qui comes Bacchi erat, quem sequebantur Satyri. Huic conjecturæ Musgravius favere ait, quod συνασπίζει plerumque sine accusativo jungatur, cuius rei exempla attulit. Idem hæc monet κάμους, ita MSS. Stephani, quorum auctoritati obtinperandum putavi. Editio Ald. κάμη, unde et κάμον facias, quod fortasse elegantius. Hoc κάμον s. κάμους etiam Heathius preferit, comessationes una peragentes. Hactenus Ccl. Hoepfnerus, Cyclopis editor doctissimus; verum mihi neutrum placet. Prima conjectura non necessaria, altera satyris, ex quibus chorum constare apertum est, nullo modo admodum data est. Vocab. κάμοι vel pro singul. κάμος, quod facile intelligas, positum est, vel, quod magis placet, pro κάμοι legendum est κάμω, quum vos in orbe saltatorio Bacchi sodales eratis, siquidem Bacchus καμάζειν πρὸς Αλθαίαν dicitur, quo eam Satyri comitabantur.

Vers. 44. et 46. Pro τάδε et δινῶν præeunte Musgravio in textum recepi τάδε et δινῶν, quod nemini displicebit, et Hoepfnerum v. Cel. non fecisse poenitet.

Vers. 49. Verba οὐ τάδε οὐ, οὐ τάδε νέμη, quibus Satyri oves, quas pascunt, appellant, dudum me offenderunt; contra unius codicis lectio οὐ τάδε, οὐτ' αὐ τάδε νέμη arrisit, cui clarissimum Jacobs in animadversionibus in Euripidis trag. et fragm. tom. 2. pag. 158. adsentiri postmodum lubenter vidi.

Vers. 60. et 61. Omnium de his versib[us] criticorum conjecturas, quas æque diligenter collegit atque adcurate examinavit cl. Hoepfnerus, denuo recensere et piget et supervacaneum arbitror. Omitto, quoque, quam modo Cyclopis laudatus editor protulit interpretationem, qui ἀμφιβάλλειν esse idem, quod χωρὶς βαλνεῖν invita Minerva censet, nec non quam equidem olim in commentationis in Agamemnonem Aeschylum particula tertia pag. 22. conjecturam βαλ· ἀμφιβαλεῖς dedi, cum verum viderit censor edit. Hoepfner. in actis literariis universalibus, quæ Jenæ innotescunt, doctissimus, ἀμφιβάλλεις h. l. significare i. q. ἀμφισβητεῖς, et vertendum esse dubitas arbitratus. Attamen interrogationis signum post v. νόμους ponendum esse nullus dubito, ut sensus exeat: *in stabulum ire forte dubitas?* In Ætnæ namque scropulis, ubi stabulum fingendum est, neque Bacchus, neque salutationes, neque Bacchæ thyrsifera sunt.

Vers. 71. Miror, neminem interpretum vidisse, v. περιβαν, quod nullo modo quadrat, propter præcedentis versus vocabulum μέλπω, cum poetarum more ad βάκχεις referendum esset, ab inseio grammatico esse corruptum. Evidem p[ro]tervæ legere et textum recipere nullus dubitavi.

Vers. 91. Acuta est Musgravii observatio, se neque quenquam

invenisse, qui ἐμβάνειν στέγην dixerit, neque, etiamsi græce dicatur, hic locum habere posse, Ulysse cum sociis nunc primum in conspectum prodeunte. Quo minus tamen amplectar conjecturam ejus—ἀζενον γυνην, prohibet literarum major, quam forte par est, diversitas. Propius certe ad vulgate scripturæ auctus nos conjicimus: ἀζενον τε γυνην, ceterum, ut cum ισασι jungatur hoc participium. Ingeniose et præclarè hæc cl. Jacobs libro sepius laudatus tom. 1. animadvertisit. Verba itaque, paulo aliter a me juncta sic vertenda esse puto: *Væ illis miseris! Quicunque tandem sint, ignorant, qualem dominus se gerat, nesciuntque, se feram et ab hominum consortio remotum terram ingressos esse.*

Vers. 169. Vera est emendatio vocabuli παραπεπασμένου, in quo nævum hærente quilibet græcae linguae peritus facile intelligit, quam de Euripidis tragœdiis optime meritus Jacobs lib. laudat. tom. 1. pag. 122. adulit. Corrigit nimurum περισκεπασμένου, quod unice v. Αἴσιων congruit.

Vers. 178—185. Mirum sane videtur, hos versus interpretum neminem, cel. Wakefield excepto, qui in silv. crit. part. iv. p. 195. v. φοροῦται mutare vult in φανόνται, i. e. λαμπονται, offendisse, cum et interpunctione et sensu laborent. Evidem non inauspicata, ut mihi videor, manu interrogationis signum, in fine vers. 179. sublatum post v. πρόδοτιν posui, ita ut v. πρόδοτιν cum διεκχοήσατε conjugatur, et versus 180. quasi parenthesi inclusus exhibeat. Pro v. φοροῦται ut φοροῦται legamus, et rei ratio et verborum nexus postulare videntur.

Vers. 244. Versum hunc esse corruptum omnes interpretes uno ore consentiunt, et inde facile adparet, quod v. δύοντος cum ἀνθρακος nullo modo conjungi possit, neque v. κρεπινόμηρ habeat, quo referendum sit. Præ ceteris mihi semper placuit emendatio cel. Ruhnkenii δίδοντος δάιτα τοῦ κρεπινόμου, donec legeram, quod censor edit. Hoepfner. in act. litter. univers. Jenens. excellentissimus εὔφορος δάιτα τοῦ κρεπινόμου conjecterat. Prima facilior, altera elegantior est, ita ut difficile sit disceptatu; quod in mente poeta habuerit.

Vers. 269. Verba ἡ κακῶς οὐτοι κακοὶ illustris. Wakefieldus in silv. crit. part. ii. pag. 53. contra Musgravium, invita sane Minerva, pro κακοὶ Euripidem scripsisse καλοὶ autumantem, optimo jure defendit, et locutionis veritatem multis exemplis probavit.

Vers. 298. Vario modo critici versum tentarunt; ut longius esset et a voluntate alienum, eorum sive interpretationes sive conjecturas laudare, quas cel. Hoepfnerus ea, qua par est, cura recensuit. Evidem jam olim adcurate animadvertisse videor, nævum non in v. ἀποτρέψου, sed in vv. εὐ λίγας potius hærente, qua propter emendationem, quam in comment. prima in Aeschyl. Agamemnonem, pag. 81. proposueraam, εὐλόγους ἀποτρέψου repetere

et textui inservere non gravatus sum. Verte: *jure meritoque instituta mortalium respice.*

Vers. 325—326. De his versibus emendandis sagacissimus Jacobs bene meritas est. Verba ejus sunt: *Musgravius conjectit, δαινύμενος, εὐ στέγοι γαστέρ' ἐνίαν ventre bene capienti ludibrium,* quod ut doctum ita nimis longe quesitum est. Melius placet quod proximo versu emendavit: *εἰτ' ἐπιπλων.* Denique hæremus in verbis πέπλου χρούω, φίλα, quoconque tandem modo explicavetis, difficultatem relinquent. Evidem totum hunc locum sic refingam:

ἢ μόσχον ὄπτον ἢ τι θήγιν δάχος
δαινύμενος εὖ, στέκων γαστέρ' ὑπελαν
εἴτ' ἐπιπλων γάλακτος ἀμφορέα, βόελον
χρούω, cet.

Odyss. I.

Cyclops γαστέρα στένων, *ventrem implens carnibus* est. Homericus ille, qui μεγάλην ἐπλήσσετο νηδύν. Vid. animadvers. in Euripidis trag. tom. I. pag. 124. Mihi in mentem venit, εὐ στένων, ita ut verbum στένω cum praecedente ἔχω cohæreat, nec interpretor *implore*, sed in proprio significatu sumo, i. e. *et dum epidur, valde propter ventrem, epuletum anhelo.* Nonne significantius et dicentis characteri adcommodatius? quod denique ad loquendi rationem πέπλου προύω attinet, nihil video, quod nos movere possit, ut a vulgata lectione recedamus, quæ non modo satis usitata est, sed conjectura etiam clarissimi Jacobs eatenus longe præferenda, quatenus vix, et ne vix quidem, ἔργοντι βθόλον dici possit.

Vers. 336. Lectionem hujus versus vulgatam eamque veram ὡς τὸ πιένιν restituui, pro qua Musgravius legendum esse ὡς τούμπιν monet, quamque Heathius corrigit ὡς τούκπιν. Namque non modo verbum simplex præstat, sed metrum etiam sanum est, siquidem, quod utrumque fugit, ultima pedis Iambei syllaba, quamvis sit natura brevis, a悲剧is passim producitur, quotiescum illa finiatur verbum. Vid. exempla, quæ Wakefieldus in Silv. Crit. part. primi. p. 81. laudavit, qui lib. I. part. 1, pag. 94. eandem sententiam protulit, nec non Lucian. de Parasito 7. allegavit, quocum Plautus Pseudol. 5. 10. conferendus est.

Vers. 360—361. Ab emendatione quam dudum margini adposueram, recessere non possum. Pro σκάφος lego σκάφει ut conjugatur cum v. μόνῳ, et interpretor verba: *noli mihi, nati aliquid tribuere, solus soli ventri navis*, i. e. venter tuo, navis ventri simili, infer. V. κόδικεν, teste Hesychio, idem est, ac βαστάζειν, ἐπιφέτειν. Vid. Trill. observ. critic. p. 144. Apte hic, et vers. 501. Cyclops venter, cum navis ventre comparatur, cuius rei exempla apud Romanos quoque extare notum est. Vid. commentationis meæ in *Æschyleum Agam.* part. tert. pag. 18.

Vers. 364—365. Verba δὲ ἔχει θυσίαν, quæ criticis multas difficultates moverunt, insulsum esse glossema vocabulorum δέοντων. VOL. XII. C.

θυμάτων, ex verbis οὐχ ἔχει θυσίαν, margini interpretationis causa adscriptis ortum, olim jam in commentat. prim. in Aeschyl. Agamem. pag. 23. docui, et hic repetere non grubesco : quibus omissis, omnia bene cohædere, et plana sanquine esse manifestum sit. Ἀποθύμιος θυμάτων h. l. dictum est, sicuti ἄχαλκος ἀσπίδων, ἀπεπλος φαρέων, ἀνόφητος κοκυμάτων, ut alia exempla omittam, quæ poetarum Græcorum lectores non fugiunt.

Vers. 391—394. Aliorum interpretationes sive emendationes àequæ, ac conjecturam, quam olim lib. I. pag. 24. dederam, relinquent cum clarissimo Jacobs Heathium sequor, qui, leni verborum transpositione adhibita, hos versus in eum modum constituit :

διθελούς τ' ἄκρους μὲν ἐγκεκαιμένους πυγή^ν
Ἐεστοὺς δρεπάνῳ ύπ., ἀλλὰ πελεκέων γνάθοις
αἰτναῖ γε σφαγεῖα, παλιούρου κλάδῳ:

σφαγεῖα αἰτναῖ. ut recte cl. Jacobs, lib. I. tom. II. p. 159. observavit, instrumenta sunt *ingentia*, ut omnia, quibus Cyclops ad usum domesticum utebatur. Vid. Aristoph. Pac. v. 72. et Hesych. sub *τ. αἰτναῖον*.

Vers. 397. Cel. Jacobs in tomo secundo *antimadvers.* in Euripidis traged. scribit; verba ρύθμῳ τίνι valde esse jejuna, cum præsertim diverso modo a Cyclope mactati in proximis versibus narrentur, et scribendum esse autumat; ἕσφαξ ἑταῖρων τῶν ἐμῶν οὐχ ἐν ρύθμῳ. Hanc emendationem etsi vir præclarissimus exemplis stabilire studeat, neque tamen metrum admittere videtur, neque de modo mactandi h. l. sermo est. Si locus noster in mendo cubet, verum omnino est codicem Paris. ad eum restituendum ansam præbere, qui verbis transpositis τίνι ρύθμῳ exhibet. Propterea eatenus clarissimq; Jacobs adsentiri non gravor, quatenus, particulâ ὥχ omissa, legendum ἐν ρύθμῳ, i. e. *uno tenore*, sive *uno ictu* censeo.

Vers. 431—433. Lubenter h. l. cum clarissimo Jacobs Musgravi conjecturam, vocabula πτέρυγας, ἀλύ in πτέρυγα, σαλεύει mutantis amplector, quæ lepidæ temulentí sensis descriptioni optime convenit. In sequentibus, ubi amicus suavissimus in verb. ἀποκερδάνων aliquid latere, quod temulentis significationem habeat, scribit, et corriger vult; ἀσθενῆς γαρ καὶ πόλλος ἀδοκανῶν, πότου ἄπειρος περὶ cet.

Non de partibus sto, et conjecturam licet ingeniosam super vacaneam arbitror. Sensus vulgaræ lectionis satis expeditus est.

Vers. 446. Ex commentario, quo Cel. Hoepfnerus Cyclopem illustravit, doctissimo satis adparet, verba hujus versus ρύθμοισι τινι interpres valde turbasse, quorum autem emendationes partim longe pétitas, partim nimis quæsitas interpretationes iterum examinare mihi neutquam in animo est. Primo obtutu intelligitur, poetam ρύθμῳ τινι scripsisse. Jam alios idem in mente habuisse video, quibus nescio quo jure ad sensum Barnesius negaverit.

Vers. 501—504. Sensum horum versuum in tert. commentatione in Aeschyl. Agamem. p. 18. vera olim interpunctione resti-

tuisse mihi videor. Post v. oīov puncti et post γάρυπαι δε communis signum pono, unde lepidissimus et aptissimus sensus oritur; *Ia! Io! Io!* plenus sum vini. *Lector onustus oblitusque lento convivio usque ad infima ventris tabulata ceu navis oneraria.* Vocabula δάιος ῥῆτος quorum sensum interpres fugisse miror, h. i. posita sunt, sicuti Pind. Pyth. II. 147. χάραγιν μίσθεν. Αεχyl. Agamem. vers. 1458. εὐηγις (sic pro corrupto v. θεηγις ibidem scribendum est) τῆς ἐμης χαλιδης. Soph. Trachin. v. 554. λυθήγιος λύπημα, i. e. sanabilis dolor, et in loco, de quo agimus, Euripidis δάκας οχέως i. e. navis oneraria.

Vers. 509—514. De nævis, quibus hi versus squalidi jacent, diluendis cānde mihi səpius cogitanti, nihil melius in mētem venit, quim quod oīm in commentatione səpius laudata pag. 21. profere conatus sum. Me itaque conjectisse non potuit, Euripidem pro δάια, quod ferri nequit, δάιει scrispsisse, ad quam conjecturam, viam monstrat editio Barnesii, quæ δάιεi ministrat. Sensus est; amatoric, amatorie oculus adspiciens (Cyclops) aula ext. Amat aliquis nos, sed mox lucerna accensa (innuit torrem in Cyclopis oculum mox intrudendum) cutem tuam in roscida spelunca cru molis sponsa comburet i. e. deperiet, et vani colores cāput tuum ornabunt. Satyros secum Cyclopem deridere et acriter cavillari in aprico est. Nonne melius esset pro tis ήμας scribere τη' ήμῶν, i. e. aliquem nostrum?

Vers. 560. Miror novissimum doctissimumque Cyclopis editorem, C. Hoepfuerum vulgatam hujus versus lectionem χ φτερ οὐχ επει, quæ partim jejunum sensum continere, partim non bene convenire versu sequenti, qui uno spiritu Silenum ebibisse docet, facile intelligitur, Musgrivii emendationi sagacissimæ χ ἀστερ οὐ κακη, i. e. sicuti non delassaberis, non gravaberis prætulisse.

Vers. 584. Hunc versum æque bene clarissimum Jacobs. in animadvers. tom. II. p. 162. Cyclopi adtribuendum esse, ac vers. 587. corrigendum censuit;

ἔνδον μὲν ὡνὴ τῷ δ' ὄπινα παρειμένος.

ταχ' ἐξ ἀναιδῶς φάρυγος αθήσει πρέσα.

ACCOUNT OF

- The Prices and Purchasers of the most valuable Articles in the Collection of the late JAMES EDWARDS, Esq. sold by Mr. I. VANS, April 5, 1815, and Five following Days, at No. 26, Pall-Mall.

- Constantini Lexicon Graecō Latinum, folio, best edition, russia, gilt leaves. [91. Petty] 1592.

49 Hollant, Herodologia Angliae, hoc est Vitæ clarissimorum Anglorum cum effigiebus a P. s. folio. This extraordinary fine copy formerly belonged to Buchetus, who wrote the Latin verses signed A. B. under each portrait. He has made corrections and additions in a very

great hand throughout the volume, apparently with a view to a new edition. [15*l.* Miller.] 1620.

67 Christopheri Thuani Tumulus, with his portrait. Par. Patisson, 1583.—J. Thuani Tumulus, Par. 1580. 4to. large paper, morocco. The copy of J. A. Thuanus. [10*l.* 10*s.* Dibdin.]

119 Johnson's Collection of the English Poets, from the time of Cowley, with Biographical Prefaces, best edition, 75 vol. 12mo. green morocco. [32*l.* Marquis of Ely.] 1790.

147 Fables de La Fontaine, 4 vol. folio, large paper, with numerous plates after Oudry's designs, most brilliant impressions, Marshal Montmorency's copy, green morocco. [42*l.* 11*s.* 6*d.* Goldsmid.] Paris, 1755.

156 Andreino, l'Adano, Sacra Representatione, 4to first edition, cuts, by C. A. Procacino, rare, green morocco, [15*l.* Burrell.] Milan, 1613.—This Italian mystery is supposed to have suggested to Milton the idea of his Paradise Lost.

162 Gesta Romanorum, folio, a very beautiful Manuscript upon vellum, of one of the most ancient Story-Books extant. It was executed for Charles VI. of France. It is written in a very legible hand, and is ornamented with nine very large Miniature Paintings, and a profusion of richly painted capitals, and various figures in gold and colors at the beginning of each Story; bound in vellum. [46*l.* Longman.]

164 Here beginneth the RECUYEL OF THE HISTORYES OF TROY, drawnen out of Latyn into Frenche, by Raoul le Fevre, and translated into Englishe by Caxton, begonne in Bruges 1468, and finyshid in Colen 1471, folio, russsia, imperfect, but contains the Colophon with Caxton's Account of the time when he executed the work. This specimen of the first printing in our language was the Exercise of Caxton's apprenticeship in Germany, being three years before he introduced the Art into England. [48*l.* 1*s.* Longman.]

165 Walpole's Castle of Otranto, printed upon vellum, blue morocco [29*l.* 8*s.* Dibdin] Parma, 1791.—One of the most beautiful and fine specimens of a modern book printed upon vellum. The edition was printed by Bodoni, at the expence of Mr. Edwards, who had six copies taken off upon Italian vellum, from each of which the sheets were carefully selected to render this copy as perfect as possible.

211 Opere di Piranesi, namely, Antichite Romane, Vedute di Roma Sepolcri degli Scipione, Magnificenza ed Architectura di Roma, Opere Vaste, Fasti Consulares, Acqua Giulia, Antichite di Cora, Campus Martius, Antichite d'Alpano e di Castel Gandolfo, Vasi e Candelabri, Colonna Trajana e Antonina, Antichite di Poestum, Teatro d'Ercolano, Maniere di adornare i Camini; 23 vol. bound in 17, Atlas folio, the original Roman editions, very first impressions of the plates, selected by Mr. E. a magnificent set, bound in russsia, [315*l.* North.]

214 Anthologia Graeca, manuscript, folio. [10*l.* 10*s.* Lunn.]—This is a transcript by the celebrated Brunck of 743 inedited Greek Epigrams, from a MS. in the King of France's Library. The original compilation was made, by Guyet, who bequeathed it to Menage. In a note at the end of the volume, Brunck says he transcribed it in 1769.

“ sedulo et quamque potui diligentia.” It may be added that this transcript far exceeds the original in interest and value, from the notes and references to critical works with which Brunck has enriched it.

224 Auli Gellit Noctes Atticæ, fol. manuscript of the XV. century, upon vellum, with all the richness of illumination in miniatures, and capitals, which distinguish the fine Italian manuscripts of the Classics under the protection of the Medici family. The writing, both of the Greek and Latin, is in the boldest and finest style of the 15th century, from which Sweynheim and Pannartz formed their types; the arms of the family for whom it was executed are in the first page, bound in red morocco. [36l. 15s. Dibdin.]

263 Horatii Opera, manuscript of the XV. century, upon vellum, fol. red morocco. [125l. Dibdin.] This is a manuscript of the first splendor, both for writing and illumination. It was executed for Ferdinand I. King of Naples, who first introduced printing into his states, and was so ardent a collector of books and manuscripts, that Mr. Roseoe relates, that the Florentines, to conciliate him in a rupture, presented him with some fine manuscripts of the Classics; as the Palæ of Florence are seen among the ornaments, this may be one of them.

278 Livii Historiarum quæ supersunt, cum Epistola Joannis Andreæ Episcopi Aleriensis ad Paulum 2 Pont. Max. folio, first edition, printed upon vellum, in the original binding, morocco. [903l. Arth.] Romæ, MCCCCCLXIX.—This splendid specimen of the press of Sweynheim and Pannartz is the only copy of the first edition of Livy known to exist upon vellum. It appears, by the arms at the bottom of the first page of the history, to have been taken off for Alexander VI. when Vice-Chancellor of the Roman See, and Governor of the Monastery of Soubiaco, where Sweynheim and Pannartz took up their abode (being a German monastery) when they introduced the art of printing into Italy.

287 Nonius Marcellus de Proprietate Sermonum, folio, printed upon vellum, with the title and 52 miniatures from the antique, in relief, on pale blue ground, most exquisitely painted for the Medici Family, as appears by the arms in the beginning of the work, bound in morocco. [199l. 10s. Dibdin.] Ven. JENSON, MCCCCCLXXVI. It is impossible for the beauty of this copy to be surpassed.

310 Prudentius, 4to. Manuscript of the X. Century upon vellum (formerly belonging to the Monastery of St. Gall), green morocco. [23l. 2s. Marquis of Douglas.]

317 Strabonis Geographia, Latinè, ex versione Guarini Veronensis et Gregorii Tiphernatis, folio, first edition, blue morocco. [42l. Dibdin.] Romæ, per Sweynheim et Pannartz MCCCCCLXIX.—One of the very rare productions of the above Printers, (only 275 copies having been printed). See the Printers' address to Sixtus IV. in Vol. I. p. 1, of the Bibliotheca Spenceriana. It is one of the finest specimens of their press, and as Audiffredi says, “typus ita integer ac nitidus aparet, ut non sine jucunditate à Bibliophilis spectari possit.”

377 Leonardo Da Vinci Regole e Precetti della Pittura, folio. Manuscript, with Original Drawings by Nicholas Poussin, morocco. [102l.

388 Thaue.]—The original Manuscript of L. da Vinci was deposited with the Barberini Family. Mr. De Chantelou, Minister of France at the Court of Rome, wishing to obtain a transcript of the rues for drawing, employed Nicholas Poussin, then pursuing his studies at Rome, to make drawings of what L. Da Vinci described. These are the subjects:—4 Drawings of Anatomical Figures; 22 Drawings of Human Figures; 2 Heads in Profile; a Hand and a Horse. This volume exhibits an admirable specimen of N. Poussin's powers of drawing, and evinces an extraordinary combination of taste, spirit, fidelity, and science.

394 Sir W. Hamilton's Collection of Etruscan, Greek, and Roman Antiquities, taken from Etruscan Vases, 4 vol. folio: *Very scarce, fine copy in russia, with borders of gold.* [53l. 11s. Copley.] Naples, 1706.

469 Holinshed's Chronicles, with the Castrations, 3 vols. folio, *best edition, red morocco.* [18l. 18s. Singer.] 1586.

574 Rapin's History of England, and Tindal's Continuation, with *Vertue's heads and monuments, very fine impressions,* 6 vol. folio, *russia, gilt leaves.* [43l. 1s. Egerton.] 1732.—The Rapin is upon the largest paper, which is *very rare*, and the Continuation of Tindal upon *fine paper, a very fine set.*

587 Ashmole's History of the Order of the Garter, folio, *large paper, very fine impressions of the plates, a beautiful copy in blue morocco;* Duke of Newcastle's copy. [42l. North.] 1672.

612 Dugdale's Monasticon Anglicanum, 3 vol. fol. *with all the plates, very fine copy, in the original binding in vellum, gilt leaves.* [33l. 17s. Sanders.] 1682.

624 Camden's Britannia, by Gough, 6 vol. fol. Best edition, illustrated with more than 1000 Views from Grose, Stukeley, &c. [52l. 10s. North.] 1806.

657 Loggan Oxonia Illustrata, fol. *morocco,* 1675.—Loggan Cambria Illustrata, fol. *russia.* [21l. North.]

672 Chroniques et Gestes des Treshauls et Tresvertueux Faits de François Premier, commençans au temps de son Advenement à la Couronne, 1514, par André de La Vigne Croniqueur du Roi et Secrétaire ordinaire de la Royne, fol. [100l. Dibdin.]—A Magnificent Manuscript on vellum, with splendid miniatures and highly ornamented capitals at the beginning of each chapter, of which many are six inches by five, displaying all the richness of invention and grandeur of execution to which the art of illumination had arrived. The first miniature occupies the whole page, fifteen inches by ten and a half, and represents Francis on his throne, surrounded by his Court; and receiving the Book from the Author. The arms of Francis the First, quartered with those of his first wife, Claude de France, are on each side of the frame-work which surrounds the picture; her arms are painted separately in a cordon; *bound in green velvet.*

757 Salviati Historia Piscium et Aquatilium Animalium, folio, *plates, large paper, ruled, a most beautiful copy, bound in morocco, in compartments, with the arms of Thurstanus richly gilt.* [30l. 10s. Clarke.] Rome, 1554.

798 The Koran of Mohammed, written in the grandest and boldest of Oriental Characters, enriched throughout with brilliant illuminations. A most splendid Manuscript in the highest preservation. It was a present from Maulowa Mohammed Achmed to Nijul al Dowlah, fol. with a blue morocco case [52l. 10s. Marquis of Douglas.]

804 Biblia Pauperum, a Collection of Designs, rudely cut in wood, of the principal Historical Subjects in the Bible; interspersed with sentences above, below, in the middle, or in scrolls, according to the ancient manner of describing figures speaking, fol. [210l. Dibdin.] The extreme rarity of this book is well known; it is esteemed the first essay towards the art of printing by blocks of wood, before the invention of moveable types, and is generally attributed to Laurence Coster of Haerlem, between the years 1440 and 1450. A very fine and perfect copy, and none of the plates injured by being painted, which is generally the case; bound in morocco.

807 Biblia Sacra Polyglotta, edente Walton, et Castelli Lexicon Polyglottum, 8 vol. fol. very fine copies in blue morocco. The Bible is ruled, and has the original republican preface to the Polyglot. [61l. Watson.] Lond. 1657.

808 Biblia Sacra Latina, Vulgata Versionis, 2 vol. fol. [175l. Lloyd.] Moguntiae, per Fust et Schöffer, MCCCCCLXII. Printed upon vellum, and decorated with rich illumination. This is the first edition of the Latin Bible with a date. A magnificent copy, the finest which has been offered to public sale for many years. The book is as full and fresh as when it came from the press; the leaves were carefully selected from two very fine copies, 2 vol. splendidly bound in blue morocco.

809 Biblia Sacra Latina, cum Interpretationibus Hebraicorum Nomina, 2 vol. fol. The first edition of the Latin Bible printed at Paris. A remarkably fine copy, in blue morocco. [34l. 2s. 6d. Triphook.] Par. MCCCCCLXXVI. It has the following colophon:

- Jam tribus undecimbris lustris Francos Ludovicus
Reverat! Ulricus Martinus itemque Michael
Orti Teutonia, hanc mihi composuere figuram
Parish arte sua, me correctam vigilanter

Yenalem in vico Jacobi, sol aureus offert.

Which establishes the date of the impression to be 1476. This is the celebrated edition which attracted so much curiosity and discussion by the imposition practised on Lord Oxford by an alteration of the colophon, and which would have ascribed it to 1463. The edition, however, is unusually rare; and Mr. Edwards, who, from his valuable and extensive correspondence on the continent, obtained more early printed books than were ever imported by any one individual, was yet more than twenty years before he could obtain a fine copy.

810 Biblia Sacra Latina, fol. [115. 10s. Triphook.] Ven. per Jenson, MCCCCCLXXIX. Printed upon vellum. This beautiful copy, of an extremely rare edition of the Bible printed by Jenson, is the only one which has occurred in any sale for many years. It belonged to Sixtus IV. as appears by his arms in the beginning of the book. To this

Account of Mr. Edwards

281 magnificent Pontiff (the founder of the Vatican Library) Sweynheims, and Pannartz addressed the well-known supplicatory letter for relief in consideration of the numerous splendid works which had been printed by them in Italy. The capitals are richly illuminated, and at the commencement is an elegant miniature; bound in red morocco.

821 Evangelia Quatuor Graecæ, fol. A magnificent Manuscript upon vellum, of the Tenth Century, most elaborately executed. The subject of each page is designated at the top in letters of gold. This grand Manuscript is in the highest preservation, and is one of the finest Greek Manuscripts of the Gospels extant. It is supposed to have been one of the Imperial Collection saved at the capture of Constantinople. It would be a most important acquisition to any library, public or private; bound in blue velvet, with bronze-gilt Medallions of the birth of Our Saviour and the adoration of the Magi on the sides. [210*L.* Payne.]

824 Psalterium Graeco-Latinum, fol. *A Manuscript of the Ninth Century upon vellum, of the first curiosity and importance,* written in a very fair and legible hand, with this peculiarity—the Greek is written in Roman characters, by which means we elicit the curious and interesting knowledge of the exact pronunciation of the Greek Language, as spoken at that period when the Byzantine Empire was in its literary glory. A very learned antiquary has given the following illustration of the writing of the first page tending to fix the period when the Manuscript must have been written:

Kyrie Boeithi ton doulon sou
Cymeon Monachous Presbiterou, &c. &c.

Nota, que je trouve ce Pierre 2. Abbé de l'Abbaye de S. Ambroise de Milan depuis l'an 856 sous Louis 11 (après l'Abbé André 851) jusqu'en l'année 897. C'est la dernière date des Diplomes de l'Abbaye de S. Ambroise de Milan, lesquels commencent en l'année 721 sous le Roi des Lombards Luitprand—dans le “Codice Diplomatico Sant Ambrozio delle Carte dell' Ottavo e Nono Secolo de F. Angelo Fumagalli.” Milano, 1805, 4to. [110*L.* 5*s.* Marquis of Douglas.]

829 Officium Beatae Virginis, 12mo. A delicate little Book of Offices of the Sixteenth Century, in Roman characters. The Paintings exquisitely finished, the writing admirable, and the border most playfully ornamented in the best style, with devices and mottos of the family for whom it was executed. This is by far the most exquisite of the Italian illuminated offices that Mr. Edwards ever had an opportunity of obtaining; blue morocco. [120*L.* North.]

830 The celebrated Bedford Missal, or 'Book of Prayers and Devotional Offices executed for John Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, containing 59 miniature paintings, which nearly occupy the whole page, and above a thousand small miniatures of about an inch and a half in diameter displayed in brilliant borders of golden foliage with variegated flowers, &c. at the bottom of every page are two lines in blue and gold letters, to explain the subject of each miniature; a circumstance perhaps only to be found in this expensive performance. But what enhances the value of the MS. in this country, is, that it has preserved

the only portrait remaining of the noble pair who formerly possessed it; John of Lancaster, Duke of Bedford, Regent of France, and Anne of Burgundy, his Duchess, interspersed with their mottoes; an elegant expression of the gallantry of that time; on his part "A vous entier," and on hers, "J'en suis contente." And also the portraits of Henry V. of England, and Catherine of France. Nothing can exceed the strength of character and high finishing of the portraits. Mr. Gough pronounced it the finest example of the art of that period he had ever seen. Vertue engraved his portrait from this painting. Another interesting characteristic in this fine MS. is the attestatio[n] of its being presented by gift of the Duchess, and by order of her husband, to King Henry the Sixth, when he went to be crowned in France, and was spending his Christmas at Rouen. The monogram of the attestor I. S. is John Somerset, styling himself *Domini regis ad personam servitor et sanitatem utique conservatorem consulens*. This is confirmed in Hearne's Vita Henrici 6, per T. de Elmham, where he is called physician to the king; and that he was a favourite appears from a grant of the Manor of Runship to him for life by Henry 6th. See Lysons's Environs, vol. 5, page 258. This rich book is 11 inches by seven and a half wide, and two and a half thick, bound in crimson velvet, with gold clasps, on which are engraved the arms of Harley, Cavendish, and Hollis, quarterly. It was the property of Edward Lord Harley, Earl of Oxford and Mortimer, who bought it of Lady Worsley, great granddaughter to W. Seymour, second Duke of Somerset, who was appointed Governor to the Prince of Wales by King Charles the First. It descended from Lord Oxford to his daughter, the Duchess of Portland, and was purchased at her sale, May 24, 1786. [687L 15s. Marquis of Blandford.]

INQUIRY
INTO THE
CAUSES OF THE DIVERSITY OF HUMAN CHARACTER
IN VARIOUS
AGES, NATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS;
By the late PROFESSOR SCOTT, of King's College, Aberdeen,
No. VI.—Continued from No. XX, p. 237.

SECT. III.

Of the Indirect Effects of Climate upon the Human Character.

THE effects of climates which I have yet considered, may be said to proceed immediately from its influence; there are other peculiarities

in the condition of men, which may fairly be traced to the influence of climate, although their dependence upon it is more remote and precarious; and these I am now to consider. They may be contemplated under the heads of first, the condition of the female sex, secondly, manner and amusements, thirdly, laws and government.

First, With respect to the condition of the female sex, we are prepared to admit from what has been detailed at the conclusion of the preceding section, that it has a chance to be more favorable in a temperate than in an intemperate climate. A moderate indulgence of the sexual appetite is much more calculated to advance the respectability of females, than either apathy, or licentiousness in this particular. In hot countries, women have almost always been considered as intended only for sensual enjoyment; they are ardently sought after, but little valued or respected when obtained; and if their persons are admired, their minds are as uniformly despised. In such countries, the inferiority of the females to the males, in every respect, except in personal attractions, is a prevailing doctrine: and in some of them, as is well known, it is even an article of religious faith.

It is in these countries that the practice of polygamy has uniformly prevailed: a practice by which the dignity of the female sex is completely sunk, and women are degraded to the rank of mere slaves. This practice has never been found in the temperate regions of the world, where women have generally been considered as objects of a certain degree of esteem, as well as of desire. The causes of this peculiarity, and its connexion with the influence of climate, have been so admirably pointed out by the celebrated Montesquieu, that I cannot do greater justice to the subject than by transcribing his words.

" Les femmes sont nubiles, dans les climats chauds, à huit, neuf, et dix ans: ainsi l'enfance et le mariage vont presque toujours ensemble. Elles sont veillées à vingt: la raison ne se trouve donc jamais chez elles avec la beauté. Quand la beauté demande l'empire, la raison le fait refuser; quand la raison pourroit l'obtenir, la beauté n'est plus. Les femmes doivent être dans la dépendance: car la raison ne peut leur procurer dans leur vieillesse un empire que la beauté ne leur avoit pas donné dans la jeunesse même. Il est donc très simple qu'un homme, lorsque la religion ne s'y oppose pas, quitte sa femme pour en prendre une autre, et que la polygamie s'introduise.

" Dans les pays tempérés, où les agréments des femmes se conservent mieux, où elles sont plus tard nubiles, et où elles ont des enfans dans un âge plus avancé, la vieillesse de leur mari suit en quelque façon la leur: et, comme elles y ont plus de raison et de connaissances quand elles se marient, ne fût-ce que parce qu'elles ont plus longtemps vécu, il a dû naturellement s'introduire une espèce d'égalité dans les deux sexes, et par conséquent la loi d'une seule femme.

" Dans les pays froids, l'usage presque nécessaire des boissons fortes établit l'intemperance parmi les hommes. Les femmes, qui ont à cet égard une retenue naturelle, parce qu'elles ont toujours à se défendre, ont donc encore l'avantage de la raison sur eux.

" La nature, qui a distingué les hommes par la force et par la raison, n'a mis à leur pouvoir de terme que celui de cette force et de cette raison. Elle a donné aux femmes les agréments, et a voulu que leur ascendant finit avec ces agréments : mais, dans les pays chauds, ils ne se trouvent que dans les commencemens, et jamais dans le cours de leur vie.

" Ainsi la loi qui ne permet qu'une femme se rapporte plus au physique du climat de l'Europe, qu'au physique du climat de l'Asie. C'est une des raisons qui a fait que le Mahométisme a trouvé tant de facilité à s'établir en Asie, et tant de difficulté à s'étendre en Europe ; que le Christianisme s'est maintenu en Europe, et a été détruit en Asie ; et qu'enfin les Mahometans font tant de progrès à la Chine, et les Chrétiens si peu. Les raisons humaines sont toujours subordonnées à cette cause suprême, qui fait tout ce qu'elle veut, et se sert de tout ce quelle veut."

" Quelques raisons particulières à Valentinien lui firent permettre la polygamie dans l'empire. Cette loi, violente pour nos climats, fut votée par Théodore, Arcadius, et Honorius." (Esprit des loix. I. 16. ch. 2.)

The reasonings of Montesquieu are perfectly agreeable to historical fact. Polygamy has in all ages been practised by the inhabitants of warm climates : and it has as uniformly been rejected by the people of temperate regions. It was the practice of the ancient Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Egyptians and Medes ; and it is at this day practised by all the African and Southern Asiatic nations, with scarce any exception. If indeed we can implicitly believe the relations of travellers, there are some exceptions of a very peculiar kind ; for we are informed that in some districts of the East, and particularly in the Ladrone or Mariaune islands, a plurality of husbands is allowed to one wife. Montesquieu speaks of a similar practice among the Naires upon the coast of Malabar, and indulges in some ingenious reasoning concerning its origin. I. 16. c. 5. A like anomaly prevailed, according to Strabo, in some districts of Media, where, he says, each woman was compelled to receive five husbands, while in other cantons each man was expected to take seven wives. (I. 11.) Such institutions, if ever they existed, are only to be viewed as the exceptions to the generally pervading practice of polygamy, and as occasioned by circumstances altogether peculiar to certain tribes. In the case of the Medes the practice probably arose from the exigencies of war, which while in one quarter of the country it had occasioned an extraordinary havoc among the men, in another might have thinned the women in consequence of the predatory incursions of the enemy.

On the other hand a plurality of wives, or of husbands, seems to have been altogether unknown in more temperate climates. Saxo Grammaticus, who wrote the history of Denmark in the twelfth century, gives no hint of such a practice prevailing, even among the Kings and Princes of his country. Crantz, in his history of the Saxons, affirms that polygamy was never known among the Northern nations of Europe ; which is confirmed by every other writer who

gives the history of any of those nations. Scheffer in particular, who writes the history of Lapland, observes, that neither polygamy nor divorce were ever heard of in that country, not even during the reign of paganism.¹ Christianity has conspired with climate to banish polygamy from most of the countries of modern Europe. But such is the influence of physical causes, that, though Christianity is the religion of Ethiopia, the natives are strongly inclined to indulge in a plurality of wives, nor are the judges severe in their condemnation of that practice. Among the Christians of Congo, polygamy is as much in use as ever it was among Pagans.

We have found the inhabitants of a rigorous & cold climate resembling those of torrid regions in many particulars, and it is not a little remarkable that while polygamy appears to have been uniformly discountenanced in the temperate districts of the continent, it has been found in those icy regions where the female sex is extremely little sought after. Polygamy, to this day, it is said, obtains in the cold country of Kamtschatka, and in the still colder country now i Hudson's bay.

This singularity can only be ascribed to the little estimation in which females are held in those regions. For polygamy can hardly prevail in countries where women are respected, and on the other hand where it does prevail it is impossible that they can be held in due estimation. Throughout all the East, and in those parts of Africa where polygamy is the practice, women are bought and sold like slaves. "The negroes," says Lord Kames, "purchase their wives and turn them off when they think proper. The same law obtains in China, in Monomotapa, in the Isthmus of Darien, in Caribea, and even in the cold country round Hudson's bay. All the savages of South America, who live near the Oroonoko, purchase as many wives as they can maintain, and divorce them without ceremony." "The sovereign of Gagri, in Africa," says the same author, "has many wives, who are literally his slaves, one carries his bow, one his arrows, and one gives him drink; and while he is drinking, they all fall on their knees, clap their hands, and sing." In the conduct of this petty tyrant we have a faithful picture of the general demeanour of the Asiatics towards their wives.

Jealousy and oppressive restraint are the invariable concomitants of the practice of polygamy. "In the hot countries of Asia," says the author just quoted, "where polygamy is indulged, and wives are purchased for gratifying the carnal appetite merely, it is vain to think of restraining them otherwise than by locks and bars, after having once tasted enjoyment." — "The Chinese," adds he, "are so jealous of their wives, as even to lock them up from their relations; and, so great is their disdence of the female sex in general, that brothers and sisters are not permitted to converse together. When women go abroad, they are shut up in a close sedan, into which no eye can penetrate. The intrigues carried on by the wives of the Chinese

¹ See Kame's *Sketches various*.

Emperor, and the jealousy that reigns among them, render them unhappy. But luckily, as women are little regarded where polygamy is indulged, their ambition and intrigues give less disturbance to the government, than in the courts of European Princes. The ladies of Hindostan cover their heads with a gauze veil, even at home, which they lay not aside except in company of their nearest relations. A Hindoo buys his wife, and the first time he is permitted to see her without a veil is after marriage, in his own house. In several hot countries, women are put under the guard of eunuchs, as an additional security; and the black eunuchs are commonly preferred for their ugliness - In the city of Mocha, in Arabia Felix, women of fashion never appear in the streets in day light, but it is a proof of manners refined above those in neighbouring countries, that they are permitted to visit one another in the evening."

Our author next proceeds to illustrate the influence of Eastern manners in corrupting the minds and inflaming the appetites of the female sex. But for what he has said upon that subject, I shall refer to his own work. (Sketches of the history of Man b. 1. sk. 6.) It is, however, sufficiently evident that such effects are necessary consequences of the practice of polygamy; and that another practice equally to be reprobated is intimately connected with it; namely, the custom above alluded to of converting men into Eunuchs. This odious refinement of jealous sensuality is found uniformly to accompany the privilege of a plurality of wives. It at once affords a proof that this practice is a violation of the original laws of nature, and shows the futility of the attempts which have been made to defend it upon the erroneous supposition that in the countries where it prevails, the number of females exceeds in a great proportion that of the males.

Let us now contemplate the condition of the female sex in those countries where polygamy never was in practice, and we shall find it much more exalted, even during the rudest periods of society. According to the testimony of many ancient writers, the women in the North of Europe were at all times respected by the other sex; they were even held in a certain degree of veneration, as beings of superior wisdom, and consulted as prophets and soothsayers. The Scandinavian women were anciently believed to be skilled in magic, and in the arts of divination, and Procopius informs us, that among the Vandals all the soothsayers were of the female sex. According to Tacitus, the Germans had no other physicians than then women who were accustomed to follow the armies in order to staunch the blood, and suck the wounds of their husbands, as well as to supply the wants and support the courage of the combatants¹. Another fact mentioned by that historian places in a very conspicuous light the respect paid to the German women. Female hostages he says, bound the Germans more strictly to their engagement than those of the male sex, for adds he, they believed that there was something sacred in the female

¹ "Ad matres, ad conjuges, vulnera ferunt acc ille numeris aut ex alijs p[ro]p[ri]etatis p[er]ficitur cibis, ut contaminari, tantaq[ue] sit.

character; and ascribed to it a superior degree of ~~foresight~~, insomuch that they never despised the opinions of women, nor neglected their advice.'

As courage was a virtue held in the highest estimation by the rude tribes who anciently inhabited the North of Europe, so it affords a convincing proof of the dignity to which the female sex had attained among those tribes, to find them eminent in the practice of that highly valued qualification. All the writers who treat of those ancient nations concur in ascribing extraordinary fortitude, and even valor to their women. Cæsar, in the first book of his commentaries, describing a battle in which he was engaged with the Helvetii, says that the women, with warlike enthusiasm, exhorted their husbands to persist in the contest, and placed the waggon behind them in a line, to prevent their flight. Tacitus and Florus assert, that several battles of those barbarous nations were renewed by their women presenting their naked bosoms, and declaring their abhorrence of captivity.² Johannes Magnus, Archbishop of Upsal, and Jornandes agree in describing the women of the Goths as full of courage; and trained to arms like the men. The latter makes particular mention of an expedition of the Goths to invade a neighbouring country, in which more women went along with the men than were left at home (b. 1.) The Goths, says Procopius, compelled by famine to surrender to Belisarius the city of Ravenna, were bitterly reproached by their wives for cowardice (Hist. Goth. l. 2.) The Longobard women, according to Paulus Diaconus, when many of their husbands were cut off in a battle, took up arms, and obtained the victory. And Saxo Grammaticus assures us that in former times, many women in Denmark applied themselves to arms.

To this we have to add the various testimonials concerning the remarkable valor of the ancient British women. Tacitus, in his annals, says that the British women frequently joined in battle with the men, when attacked by an enemy. It was not, he says, unusual for that nation to fight under the conduct of a woman.³ Nay, so much was the female sex regarded, that according to the same author there was no distinction observed between it and the male in conferring authority.⁴ Of the valor and patriotism of female British chieftains, ancient history affords many notable examples. During the war carried on by Caractacus, against the Romans, Cartimandua Queen of the Brigantes, afforded that gallant Monarch eminent assistance. Boudica, and Boadicea, are both recorded in Roman annals, as Queens of a warlike and heroic spirit; and both combated their invaders, if not with ultimate success, at least with unshaken bravery.

² "Inesse quinetiam sanctum aliquid et previdum putant: nec aut consilia eorum aspernatur, aut responsa negliguntur." (De Mor. Germ.)

³ "Memoria proditur, quasdam actes inclinatas jam et labentes a feminis restitutas constantia precium et objectu pectorum, et monstratae ominus captivitate quam longe impatientius terminatum suarum nomina timent." Tacitus de mor. Geru.

⁴ "Solutum quidem Britannus foeminarum ductu bellare?" (Annal. l. 14)

"Neque enim sexum in imperio discernunt." (Vit. Agric.)

Neither is it to be imagined from these proofs of manly courage in the females of ancient Britain and Scandinavia, that they were destitute of the peculiar attractions of their sex, or disgustingly harsh and masculine in their demeanour. We have the authority of Procopius, that the women in those countries were remarkable for beauty, and that those of the Goths and Vandals were the finest that ever had been seen in Italy. (*Hist. Goth.* l. 3.) The literary remains, if they can so be called, of those ancient nations, testify that among them the female sex was the object of a delicate and reverential homage, which could only be due where there was mildness of manners, and propriety of conduct. The ancient poems of Scandinavia contain very refined expressions of love and regard for the female sex. "It is," says Lord Kames, "an additional proof of the great regard paid to women in Scandinavia, that in Edda, the Scandinavian bible, female deities make as great a figure as male deities." If the authenticity of the poems of Ossian be admitted, they afford very singular evidence of the delicate homage paid by the warriors of Caledonia in those remote ages to the fair objects of their affections. But this subject will again come under our notice; and without dwelling farther upon it at present, it may be safely assumed, from the evidence adduced, that among the ancient nations of the North of Europe, females were an object of refined affection, as well as of respect.

Thus, therefore, in regard to the condition of the female sex, we find a decided superiority in the natural influence of a temperate climate over that of a climate either unusually hot or cold. In hot climates, where women arrive at the age of puberty, while their intellectual powers are necessarily dormant, they are sought after merely as the means of sensual gratification; and seldom rise above the condition of slaves. In regions of extreme cold, their condition is little better, as the love of the sex is not sufficient to counterbalance the contempt inspired by inferiority of strength. But in countries which are exempt from either extreme of temperature, the passion for the female sex is compounded of respect and affection, as well as appetite. The women are not considered as mere vehicles of sensual enjoyment, because the growth of their intellectual capacities keeps pace with the ripening of their personal charms. They are admitted as the rational companions of the men; as the sharers in their victories, and the partakers in their power; and as qualified to assist them in counsel and in the field, as well as to sweeten and alleviate their sufferings and toils.

2dly. We have to contemplate the influence of climate, as it affects the manners and amusements of a people; and I cannot help thinking that even in these particulars, which might seem to be very remotely connected with it, the influence of climate is very considerable. As far as we have yet established the operation of climate, we find that in torrid regions its tendency is to produce indolence, and a strong propensity to sensual gratification. In those regions too, the soil is generally fertile; so that abundance of the necessaries, and even many of the superfluities of life, can be obtained with little toil. This circumstance greatly contributes to confirm the indolent tendency of the

people, and by no means counteracts their propensity to sensuality. The effect of the whole together is to produce a fondness for what is called luxury.

There is a considerable difference of opinion concerning the peculiar indulgences in which luxury consists; and the word has no doubt been employed in very different acceptations by different writers; insomuch that while with some it conveys a severe imputation, with others it includes scarcely any censure. Without entering into this controversy, I shall merely state that, luxury, according to the meaning in which I here employ it,¹ denotes a fondness for the various indulgences of sense, of the taste, of the eye, of the ear, of the smell, and of the touch, as well as of the sexual appetite; a proneness to indulge in those gratifications in a far greater degree than the simple calls of nature justify, and a consequent dereliction of the more noble purposes for which human nature was intended. Luxury, taken in this sense, is not very different from what is usually called effeminacy.

That it is the natural tendency of a hot climate to promote this kind of luxury and effeminacy, can scarcely be doubted, if we allow to

¹ "Men in different ages," says Lord Kaines, "differ widely in their notions of luxury; every new object of sensual gratification, and every indulgence beyond what is usual, are commonly termed *luxury*: and cease to be luxury when they turn habitual. Thus every historian, ancient and modern, while he inveighs against the luxury of his own times, wonders at former historians, for characterising as luxury, what he considers as conveniences merely, or rational improvements. Hear the Roman Historian talking of the war that his countrymen carried on successfully against Antiochus king of Syria: "Luxuria enim peregrina origo ab eventu Asiatico inventa in urbem est. Si primum lectos seratos, vestem stragulam pretiosam, plagulas et alia textilia, et quae tum magnifice supelleftilis habebatur, monopodia et abacos Romanum advererunt. Tunc psaltrae, sambuci strigulae, et convivalia ludionum oblectamenta addita epulis epula quoque ipsa et curæ et sumptu magiore adparagi coepit: tum coquus, vilissimum antiquis mancipiis estimatione et usu, in pretio esse; et, quod ministerium fuerat ars haberit copta. Vix tamen illa, quæ tum conspiciebantur, semina erant futuræ luxurie." (Tit. Liv. I. 59. c. 6.)

His Lordship relates as a remarkable misapplication of the reproach of luxury or effeminacy, that "a knot of Highlanders benighted, wrapped themselves up in their plaids, and lay down in the snow to sleep. A young gentleman making up a ball of snow, used it for a pillow. His father (Sir Evan Cameron), striking away the ball with his foot, "What, Sir," says he; "are you turning effeminate?" He is inclined to limit the term "luxury" to the excessive and habitual indulgence in "the pleasures of taste, touch, and smell, which appear as existing at the organ of sense, and upon that account are held to be merely corporeal;" and he does not think it properly applicable to any pleasure of the eye or ear. But surely, though we should grant that "the concord of sweet sounds," is an innocent and even dignified indulgence, yet we can hardly exclude from the class of luxuries, splendid ornaments of dress, showy equipages, superb houses, and other "lusts of the eye" which are so much sought after by a wealthy and luxurious people. (See Kaines's Sketches, b. 1. sk. 7.)

such a climate, the effects already ascribed to it. Where man is naturally inclined to be idle, and where nature is usually prolific in her gifts, active exertion, whether bodily or mental, will rarely be found. Some expedient must be adopted to fill up the painful void which is thus created, and the pleasures of sense are those which naturally offer themselves for that purpose. Feasting and debauchery effectually occupy the mind and keep off ennui, at least during the moments of immediate enjoyment. Their natural accompaniments are splendid dresses, showy apartments, downy couches, and every resource of art for promoting ornament or ease. Sumptuous equipages, and long retinues of attendants in time succeed; and thus is perfected that luxurious splendor, which we now emphatically call Asiatic or Oriental.

Even in the remotest ages we shall find evidence of a propensity to this kind of enjoyment among the people of the warmer regions of the earth. In the days of the patriarch Abraham, the Asiatic nations are described as possessed of various kinds of jewels, and vessels of gold and silver. In Isaac's time, we find mention of sumptuous and perfumed garments; of which kind were those of Esau, which Rebecca caused Jacob to put on. We find, therefore, the use of perfumes or sweet-smelling odors, introduced among the people of the East, even in the most distant ages; from which we may presume that they were acquainted with other arts of luxury, which Moses had no opportunity of mentioning.

In Egypt we can trace the introduction of luxury also in the most remote ages. In the days of Joseph, we find that the Egyptians were possessed of costly jewels, vessels of gold and silver, rich stuffs and perfumes, and were waited upon by a great number of slaves. This patriarch dwelt in a superb palace, and had a master of the household to manage his domestic affairs. When he went abroad, he had many attendants, and a herald went before the procession, and proclaimed the occasion of it to all the people. At this period the court of Pharaoh makes a very magnificent and brilliant appearance. There we find a chief butler, a chief baker, a captain of the guards, &c. Persons of distinction were then drawn in chariots, of which they had various kinds, suited to a variety of occasions. The establishment of the queens of Egypt must have been very splendid, if we may judge of it from what Diodorus relates, that the whole revenue of the fishing of the lake Moeris was allotted for the purpose of finding those princesses in robes and perfumes. This sum was by no means inconsiderable, for it was said to amount to a talent a-day. (Diod. l. 1. and Athen. l. 1.)

The little we know of the ancient Assyrians proves them to have been not less addicted to luxury than the Egyptians. Their monarchs, from Semiramis down to Sardanapalus, are represented by ancient historians as devoted to sensual indulgence and sunk in effeminacy; and if such were the manners of the court, it is impossible that those of the people could have been very exemplary.

Concerning the ancient Babylonians, we have much more distinct information; and all ancient writers agree in representing them as a

people strongly addicted to luxury and debauchery. The sacred books are full of reproaches uttered by the prophets against this depraved nation. By Daniel they are represented as altogether devoted to gluttony and drunkenness. What we read in this prophet of the feast which Balthasar made for all his court, at the eve of the taking of Babylon by Cyrus, may serve to give us an idea of the excess and licentiousness which reigned in the repasts of the Babylonians. The account given by Quintus Curtius of the manners of the same people agrees in every respect with that of the sacred prophet. It was a practice almost peculiar to the Babylonians of all the nations of the East, to admit women to their banquets, a circumstance which cannot be supposed to have diminished either the luxury or the dissoluteness of the entertainment.

The dress of the Babylonians was extremely sumptuous. Even the common people, according to Herodotus (l. 1. n. 195,) had a tunic of lawn next their skin, which descended to their feet, in the Eastern mode. Above that they wore a woollen robe, and again wrapped themselves in a cloak, which was of an extraordinarily white color. They let their hair grow long, and covered their heads with a kind of bonnet or turban. According to the same author, and Strabo, (l. 16.) each of these people wore a signet on his finger, and never went abroad without having in his hand a staff or baton of elegant workmanship, on the top of which was raised some distinguishing ornament, as a pomegranate, a rose, a lily, or an eagle.

Persons of high rank affected in their dress a much greater degree of magnificence. They were not contented with stuffs of silver and gold, embellished with splendid dyes and the finest embroidery; but enriched them still further, with rubies, emeralds, sapphires, pearls, and all the jewels of the East. Collars of gold were also a part of their finery, as Sextus Empiricus informs us. (l. 3. c. 24.) The Babylonians too greatly delighted in perfumes, of which they made constant use; frequently perfuming the whole body with odoriferous waters. (Herod. ut supra.) The Babylonian perfume was even peculiarly renowned among the nations of antiquity, for the singular excellence of its composition. (Athen. l. 15. c. 13. Plut. in Artax.)

In the decorations of their apartments, as might naturally be expected, the greatest splendor prevailed. The scripture makes mention of vessels of ivory, marble and brass, with which the Babylonian dwellings were adorned; and by the same authority it appears, that many of these implements were ornamented and enriched with precious stones. Costly carpets were an article of luxury in which the Babylonians had attained great excellence. Pliny, speaking of a carpet fit for covering those couches which the ancients made use of at table, says, that this piece of furniture, which was the produce of the looms of Babylon, was valued at eighty one thousand sestertia, or near six hundred pounds sterling. (l. 8. sect. 74). It appears also from Herodotus, (l. 1. n. 199,) that litters were in general use among the Babylonians, a sort of conveyance which has never been employed but by a voluptuous and effeminate people.

The ancient Medes have been scarcely less exclaimed against for their luxury and effeminacy by the writers of antiquity than the Babylonians. In the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, Strabo, Athenaeus, Diodorus, and Justin, we find ample proofs of their passion for pageantry and luxurious indulgence. They wore long flowing robes with large hanging sleeves, a dress well calculated, says Xenophon, to conceal the defects of the shape. These robes were woven with various splendid colors, and richly embroidered with gold and silver. (Herod. I. 1. n. 111. Xenoph. Cyrop. I. 8.) They allowed their hair to grow, and covered their heads with a tiara, or kind of pointed cap of great magnificence. They were besides loaded with bracelets, gold chains, and necklaces adorned with precious stones; (Ib.) and carried their uicety in dress so far as to tinge their eyelids and eyebrows, paint their faces, and mingle artificial with their natural hair. (Xen. Cyrop. I. 1.)

The luxury of the table amongst the Medes was equal to that of their dress. Xenophon describes a feast which Astyages gave to the youthful Cyrus, in which there was the utmost profusion as well in the quantity, as in the variety and quality of the different meats. According to the same authority, excess in wine was an usual accompaniment of such entertainments. (Cyrop. I. 1.) That author also records an instance of this kind of intemperance sufficiently remarkable. In the war which Cyaxares, the last of the Median kings, made against the Babylonians, Cyrus, who had joined his arms to those of that prince, finding a favorable occasion of worsting the enemy, set out on the night at the head of all the cavalry. Cyaxares, on the contrary, passed the same night in a debauch, which he carried to great excess with all his principal officers. (Ut supra.)

Music, amongst the Medes, was called in to heighten the pleasures of the table. They sung and played upon a variety of instruments. The monarchs themselves took part in this diversion, and usually in every thing that could animate the jollity of the feast. Dancing also is to be reckoned among the pleasures of the Medes; and according to Xenophon they gave into it with great ardor and transport. (Cyrop. I. 1. and 4.)

To this detail of the luxurious taste of the ancient Eastern nations, I might add what authors have recorded of the magnificence, pageantry and effeminacy of the Persian court, during the contest of that nation with the Greeks; the pomp and parade of the court of Armenia, during the reign of Tigranes, and so forth: but the description would consist of little other than a repetition of the particulars already stated. It ought also to be mentioned, that the taste for luxury and magnificence was characteristic of these nations only at certain periods of their history; at those namely, when they had acquired dominion over their more feeble and effeminate neighbours; for the Persians and Armenians, properly so called, were naturally a hardy and enterprising race, sprung from a rugged soil, and enjoying a tolerably temperate climate; but like many other nations, they were corrupted by conquest, and contaminated by the effeminate manners of the people over whom they acquired power.

It is equally unnecessary to illustrate the tendency of a sultry climate and fertile soil to encourage luxury and effeminacy, by examples drawn from modern nations. The prevalence of these vices among the present inhabitants of the South and East, among the modern Turks, Persians, Hindoos, Moguls, &c. is too well known to stand in need of proof in this place.

Let us then proceed to contrast this propensity of the inhabitants of warm climates, with what naturally takes place in the temperate regions of the earth. There, in the earlier ages of the world, we hear nothing of elegant and flowing robes, of costly vessels of gold and silver, of magnificent houses and equipages, or of delicious and luxurious repasts. Simplicity in external appearance, and frugality and temperance in living, or at least in eating, seem to have been as characteristic of these people, as the opposite dispositions were of those just described. Let us here, as on former occasions, take for our guide Tacitus, whose philosophical account of the manners of the ancient inhabitants of the North of Europe contains very satisfactory proofs of this remarkable distinction.

"All the Germans," says that author, "cover themselves with a cloak, fastened by a clasp, or sometimes by a thorn only. The rich are distinguished by a vestment, which is not flowing, as those of the Sarmatians and Parthians, but fits closely to their limbs. They likewise wear the skins of beasts, which are more studiously prepared as we recede from the frontiers. These hides they diversify with spots, and with the skins of those creatures which the remotest ocean produces. Neither does the dress of the women differ from that of the men, unless that they sometimes use linen vestments variegated with purple; and that the upper part of their garment is not fashioned into sleeves. Their arms are bare to the shoulders, and the upper part of the breast is uncovered." "There are," says he, "to be seen among them vessels of silver, received as gifts by their ambassadors and princes: but they are employed with as little ceremony, as those of earth." "That the Germans do not inhabit cities," says he, "is sufficiently known. They dwell apart from each other, according as they are attracted by some favorite fountain, field, or grove. They make no use of cement, or of tiles; and in general employ in their houses materials that are rude and inelegant. Some few places they diligently cover with an earth of such purity and splendor, that it produces the effect of a colored painting." "Their food," he says, "is simple, consisting of wild apples, game, milk and cheese; and served without show or any extraneous incitement." What he writes concerning their funereal ceremonies strongly marks the prevailing simplicity of manners. "They are not desirous of funereal honors. The only ceremonial is, that the bodies of illustrious persons are consumed by certain woods. The funeral pile is ornamented neither with garments, nor with perfumes. The arms alone, and sometimes the horse of the deceased, are bestowed upon it. A turf distinguishes the sepulchre. The cumbrous honors of a monument, as displeasing to the departed shade, are uniformly contemned. They soon dismiss cries and lamentation, but long retain a real grief. It is reckoned

becoming in the women to bewail their loss: in the men to remember it only.¹

Such is the contrast that may be traced in the manners of the people of the South and of the North, or more properly in those of the inhabitants of a sultry and of a temperate climate. Among the first a passion for empty show, and the delights of the senses, is found to prevail; the latter are naturally little charmed by external splendor, and are too hardy to place much value on luxurious indulgence. Their pleasures and amusements are usually of a very different class. They are not sought in costly robes, downy couches, or splendid banquets: but in the arduous toils of the chase, in contests of strength or warlike skill, or in listening to the traditional legends which record the feats and prowess of their ancestors. Tacitus mentions it as a prevailing amusement of the German youth, to expose themselves naked in a dance amidst swords and javelins,² an exercise well calculated to qualify them for the toils of war. How well they encountered the dangers of the fight, we are already qualified to judge, from what our author records of the heroism of the chosen band of the companions to the prince. To this we may add his testimony of the high spirit of honor prevalent among the German soldiers, which rendered it the height of disgrace to relinquish their shield in battle. "Those," says Tacitus, "who met with this misfortune, were disqualified from assisting at the sacred rites or appearing in council, and many of those who ignominiously survived a battle, terminated their shame by a voluntary death."³

" Tegunuen omnibus sagum, fibula, aut, si desit, spina consortum. Locupletissimiveste distinguuntur non fluitante, sicut Sarmati ac Parthi, sed stricta et singulos artus exprimente. Gerunt et ferarum pelles proximi ripæ negligenter, ulteriores exquisitus, ut quibus nullus per commercia cultus. Eligunt feras, et detacta velamina spargunt maculis, pellibusque belluarum, quas exterior oceanus atque ignotum mare gignit. Nec aliis feminis quam viris habitus nisi quod feminæ saepius lineis amictibus velantur, eosque purpura variant, partemque vestitus superioris in manicas non extendunt, nudæ brachia ac lacertos. Sed et proxima pars pectoris patet." "Est videre apud illos argentea vasa legatis et principibus eorum muneri data, non in vita vilitate quam quæ humo finguntur." " Nullas Germanorum populis utes habitari satis notum est, ne pati quidem inter se junctas sedes. Colunt discreti ac diversi, ut fons, ut campus, ut nemus placuit. Ne clementorum quidem apud illos aut tegularum usus. Materia ad omnia utuntur informi, et citra speciem ait delectationem. Quidam loca diligentius hincunt terra ita pura ac splendente, ut picturam ac linea menta colorum imitetur." "Cibi simplices, agrestia poma, recens fera, aut lac concretum. Sine apparatu, sine blandimentis expellunt famem." " Fuerum nulla ambitio. Id solum observatur, ut corpora clarorum virorum certis lignis cremenatur. Struem rogi, nec utes, nec odoribus cumulant. Sua cuique arma quorundam igni et equis adjicitur. Sepulchrum cespes erigit. Monumentorum arduum et operosum honorem, ut graveri defunctis aspernantur. Lamenta ac lacrymas cito, dolorem et tristitiam tarde ponunt. Feminis lugere honestum est: viris meminisse."

² " Genus spectaculorum unum atque in omni cœtu idem. Nudi juvenes, quibus id ludicrum est, inter gladios se atque infestas frameas saltu faciunt."

³ Scutum reliquise præcipuum flagitium. Nec aut sacris adesse, aut concilium inire ignominioso fas. Multique superstites bellorum infamiam aquæ finierunt.

There is one kind of sensual indulgence, to which the nations of the north appear to have been more addicted than those of the south, namely intoxication. "The Germans," says Tacitus, "have not the same temperance in drinking as in eating. If one were to indulge their love for liquor to the extent of their desires, they might be conquered not less easily by their vices than by arms."¹ This propensity may be called the vice partly of their climate, partly of their rude and uncivilized state. In countries where the cold is occasionally piercing, as was the case in ancient Germany, the inhabitants are much inclined to indulge in strong liquors; and in such countries this indulgence is not accompanied with the same madness of intoxication nor productive of the same deleterious effects upon the constitution, as in those of a warmer climate. It is likewise universally found that men but a little degree removed from the savage state, are prone to this pernicious indulgence which effectually for a time relieves them from the painful listlessness occasioned by their want of intellectual employment. The habits of the present North American Indians afford a satisfactory commentary upon these observations; and indeed in many particulars bear a very close resemblance to those of the Germans as described by Tacitus. Among them we find the same passion for military glory, the same contempt of danger and even death; the same patient endurance of every privation, with the same occasional tendency to excess. In one important particular however, there was a remarkable distinction. Among the ancient Germans, the female sex was in very high estimation; but among the North American Indians its condition is low, which seems to arise from a frigidity of constitution, natural to those tribes.

The Germans, according to Tacitus, employed for a singular purpose their proneness to convivial excess. They were accustomed during their potations to deliberate concerning peace and war; judging that at no other period was the mind more ardent, or more free from the bias of crooked policy. They took care, however, not to resolve finally till sober reflection returned.² The whole nations of Scandinavia were greatly addicted to excess in liquor; insomuch that the quaffing endless draughts of beer makes a conspicuous figure among the joys of the immortals as described in the Edda. The Russians of the North are to this day too much addicted to the same vice. But the particulars above detailed of the manners of the Babylonians and other Southern nations, serve to prove that it is a vice by no means confined to the people of the colder regions of the earth.

An amusement of a far more dignified nature in which the ancient Scandinavians and Germans highly delighted was the poetical recital

¹ *Adversus satia non eadem temperantia. Si indulseris ebrietati suggerendo quantum concupiscunt, haud minus facile vitis quam armis vincentur.*

² *De pace denique ac bello plerunque in convivis consultant: tanquam nullo magis tempore aut ad simplices cogitationes pateat animus, aut ad magnas incalescat. Ergo delecta et multa omnium mens postera die retrahatur, et salva utrisque temporis ratio est. Deliberant, dum fingere nesciunt: constituant, dum errare non possunt.*

of the heroic deeds of their ancestors. Such recitals, according to Tacitus, inflamed the courage of the Germans, and served them as omens of the fortune of future warfare. Nor was it so much by the charms of harmony as by the display of heroism that the bearers were delighted, for, according to that author, a harshness of tone was affected, and the voice was rendered deeper and more resounding by the application of a shield to the mouth of the bard.¹ Both Strabo and Diodorus Siculus make mention of the bards of the ancient Gauls, to whom they assign the province of composing songs in praise of deceased heroes. Lucan speaks of this respected class of men in the following terms.

Vos quoque, qui fortes annas, belloque premitas,
Iaudibus in longua vates dimititis r̄sum,
Plurima seculi ludisti carmina bardi.

It were easy to multiply evidence of the universal prevalence of this profession among the nations of the north, and the high estimation in which it was held. In ancient chronicles, the kings of Denmark, Sweden and Norway are represented as constantly attended by bards, which were there called Scalds or Scalders, and treated with the highest respect. Harold Haflager, we are informed, placed these minstrels above all his other officers; and employed them in negotiations of the greatest importance. Hacon earl of Norway, in a celebrated engagement against the warriors of Tomsburg, was attended by five bards, each of whom animated the courage of the soldiers when about to engage, by a war-song, and mention is made by Saxo Grammaticus, in his description of a battle between Waldemar and Sueno, of a scald or bard belonging to the former, who advanced to the front of the army, and in a pathetic strain of poetry, reproached Sueno for the murder of his own father.

The term bard is of British or Celtic origin, and those among the ancient British who were of this profession, formed a distinguished class among the Druids, and employed their strains in order to excite religious enthusiasm, as well as the ardor for military glory. Among the Caledonians, even of the most remote antiquity, we have a singular proof of the high powers of this distinguished order, in the Poems of Ossian, supposing the authenticity of these productions to be established. This most accomplished of all the bards of Celtic antiquity was not less remarkable by the dignity of his birth, than by the sublimity of his genius, since he was the son of that very king of Morven whose exploits he has so exquisitely celebrated. This circumstance is by no means inconsistent with the character of the times, for in

¹ Sunt illis hæc quoque carmina, quorum relatu quem Bairdum vocant, incidunt animos fūtræque pugnæ fortunam ipso cantu augurantur, terrent enim, trepidantve, prout sonuit acies. Nec tam vox illæ quam virtutis concentus videtur. Affectatur præcipue asperitas soni et fractum murmur objectus ad os scutis, quo plenior et gravior vox repertus est inter se.

many other instances was the ancient character of bard united with elevated rank and warlike fame. Regnar, king of Denmark, was no less distinguished in poetry than in war. Rogwald, earl of Orkney, passed for one of the ablest poets of his day. Harald the valiant, who flourished in the eleventh century, has immortalized himself by a beautiful poem, in which he complains that, notwithstanding his numerous achievements, he is unable to subdue the scorn of a beauteous Russian princess.

Among the Indians of North America, it is a favorite amusement to listen to songs which detail in animated language the warlike exploits of their ancestors. These poetical effusions, however, are not executed by any particular class of men, but are generally left to the seniors, or those who happen to be most versant in such traditional lore. But we have very satisfactory evidence, that among the Greeks, during the heroic ages, the esteem for such martial poetry was so great, that it formed the employment of a separate profession, as among the ancient Scandinavians. Homer makes honorable mention of Thamyris and Tiresias, two celebrated bards of those ages; and he describes as one of the highest gratifications at the court of Alcinous the bard Demodocus, pouring forth to the sound of the lyre his lofty strains. It can hardly be considered as degrading to this divine poet himself, to enrol him among a class of men, anciently so highly honored, if, as is justly his due, we place him foremost in the list of all the celebrated bards of antiquity.

Among the people of warmer climates, poetry and music have at all times been sought after as occasional sources of pleasure: but we do not find that they ever attained to that dignified rank, which they evidently possessed among the nations just mentioned. They were considered only as fleeting amusements, calculated to heighten the pleasures of the table, or fill up a vacant hour, but by no means adapted to elevate or invigorate the soul. Hence it does not appear that the profession of poet ever rose to much dignity among the inhabitants of the torrid regions. Like that of a mere musician in modern times, it was encouraged as an occasional luxury, but the talents which it demanded were not considered as of the most honorable kind. It was not deeds of arms, and heroic achievements that formed the favorite subjects of Eastern poetry, but the softer blandishments of love, luxurious and highly-colored description, and the eccentric wanderings of a lively and unchastened imagination.

If such be the character of Asiatic poetry, would a monarch of that country ever have thought of employing one of his minstrels for the purpose, which, according to Homer, Agamemnon intended to effect by a celebrated musician or bard of his time? On setting out for Troy, that prince, if we may credit the poet, in order to secure the fidelity of his queen Clytemnestra, left her under the charge of a bard, whose office it was to regulate her unruly desires by the sound of his lyre. Egysthus, he adds, could not triumph over the virtue of Clytemnestra till he had put to death the minstrel whose strains had

such a salutary effect. (See Odyss. I. 3. v. 267, &c.) Whatever there may be in this story, it shows that among the ancient Greeks, poetry and music were not considered as trifolous amusements, but as rational and dignified enjoyments. In confirmation of this, many other facts might easily be adduced, such as Solon promulgating his laws to the sound of his lyre, his quelling a sedition at Athens by the same means; the great efficacy ascribed to the music of Timotheus upon the manners of the Lacedemonians; and various other particulars, which are so generally known, that it would be superfluous to detail them in this place.

This remarkable distinction in the character of the poetry and music of sultry and of temperate climates, seems to have had very extensive effects upon the prevailing amusements and occupations of the people of these different regions. Among the luxurious Asiatic nations, as we have had occasion to remark, the gratifications of the table, the splendor of equipage, ornament and dress were among the principal sources of enjoyment; and poetry and music were only occasionally called in to exhilarate the festive hour, or furnish a new incitement to the palled appetite. Among the people of more temperate regions, on the contrary, the mind was interested by the exertions of the minstrel; he was listened to with the ardor of enthusiasm, as he poured forth in song the exploits of former ages, and the praise of departed heroes. His maxims were considered as the precepts of experience, and his sentiments as the dictates of virtue. He was not only admired and cherished, but he was also esteemed and honored.

It followed as a natural consequence that among these nations poetry and music gradually rose to a state of high cultivation, as the people emerged from barbarism, and as the various arts became objects of lively interest and curiosity. Among the Greeks, when the useful arts of life were at the lowest ebb, when princes were in the habit of performing for themselves the most menial offices, and when their domestic comforts were not much greater than those now possessed by the meanest peasant, the art of poetry, and as may reasonably be supposed, its twin sister music were in a very high state of improvement. It was during this almost barbarous period, that Homer, the ~~—~~sublimest poetical genius that the world has yet seen, arose; and the era of his immortal compositions adds not a little to the interest which is roused by their intrinsic merit. The poems of Homer carry with them distinct traces of the rudeness of the age in which they were composed; and if there were any doubts of their authenticity, there is sufficient internal evidence to remove all such uncertainty. In these poems we find the liveliest pictures of genuine simplicity of manners, not unmixed with a considerable degree of rudeness and even barbarism; and many of the maxims and sentiments of morality are such as cannot be approved by a more refined age. But we likewise find, along with the sublimest effusions of genius, the language of true heroism, and sentiments admirably adapted to rouse the enthusiasm of a warlike people: occasionally too we meet with the most moving delineations of the softer and more attractive emotions of the human

Inquiry into the Causes of

breast, of compassion for the distressed, of filial piety, and of conjugal affection.

We shall look in vain for such sentiments in the poetical compositions of the luxurious Asiatic nations of the same period; or even of an age of much greater refinement, while in Greece the age of Homer was succeeded by a poetical era of nearly equal genius, and of much greater correctness of sentiment. That country will always be peculiarly distinguished for having given birth to the drama, an application of the poetic art, which has been productive of very remarkable effects upon the manners of mankind. The origin and progress of dramatic poetry are much better known, than of almost any other art, and the honor of both is almost entirely due to Greece. It was at Athens that Thespis first taught the singers at the festival of Bacchus to intermix with their odes in honor of the divinity, an episodical fable expressive of some interesting event; it was there that Eschylus brought forward his actors completely prepared to represent the characters to which the fable related; and that Sophocles and Euripides brought the Greek tragedy to its most perfect state. The Greek comedy also was invented and perfected in the same city.

The drama we still consider as a school of manners; but at the period of society of which we are treating, its influence in this respect must have been much more considerable. Rude men are much more caught by spectacles than the polished and refined; and the Grecian drama was calculated by the splendor of its decorations, the power of its music, and the sublimity of its poetry, to produce the most impressive effect. We find accordingly that the Greeks had a passionate fondness for theatrical representations, and bestowed much attention upon their regulation. At Athens, commissioners were named by the state, whose office it was to judge of the merit of dramatic pieces: none were allowed to be represented that had not been examined by the commissioners: that which obtained the plurality of suffrages was crowned or declared victorious, and represented at the expense of the republic with all possible pomp and magnificence. (Plut. in Cimone.)

The sentiments in the Greek tragedies are in general calculated to inspire heroism, the love of freedom, ardent patriotism, parental and filial affection, a contempt of danger and even of death, in the cause of our native country, and a pious submission to the will of the Gods. Such too were the prevailing opinions of the people to whom these dramas were addressed. The Greek comedy, along with much appropriate satire on the prevailing absurdities and vices of the age, indulged too much, it must be acknowledged, in personal invective, coarse indecency, and looseness of morality. But in its last stage of improvement it became greatly refined of this dross; and constituted on the whole a lively and not uninstructive delineation of human manners. Taking the ancient drama as consisting both of tragedy and comedy, it will be allowed, that it was calculated to produce very happy effects upon a people who were taught to consider it as a source of high enjoyment, and to devote to it their most precious hours of ease and relaxation.

Among the luxurious nations of Asia we find scarce any traces of dramatic poetry, and it does not appear that in that country dramatic exhibitions ever formed a common source of amusement :¹ the prevailing pleasures of these nations were certainly of a less rational and dignified kind ; they were directed to the senses and the passions, rather than to the intellect or the imagination ; and were more calculated to debase than to elevate the dignity of the human character. The history of the nations of the East is in perfect conformity to these conclusions, for it uniformly exhibits to our view examples of effeminacy, pusillanimity, and sensuality ; while that of the European nations of antiquity as uniformly abounds with instances of hardness, heroism, and magnanimity.

If we inquire into the peculiar manners and amusements of the natives of extremely cold regions, we shall find that, as in former cases, there is a decided advantage in favor of the people of temperate climates ; although there is not here the same analogy which we have hitherto found between the effects of climates, which greatly exceed the middle temperature, either by their heat or by their cold. The prevailing characteristic of the inhabitant of the circumpolar regions appears to be apathy and indifference. His passions are torpid ; and his desires limited to a provision against the immediate wants of nature. With him, therefore, luxury is a thing utterly unknown. His hut, his dress, and his utensils, are formed with no farther view than to protect him from the rigors of his climate, and to supply his most pressing necessities. And his time is too much taken up in providing for the wants of the moment, or in indulging his propensity to indolence, to allow of his cultivating the elegant arts of life, or of forming a taste for any of the more rational and refined sources of amusement.

There is evidence of a better taste for poetry among some of the Northern tribes, than could well have been expected from their very rude and barbarous condition. Some of the songs of the Laplanders exhibit a refined tenderness, and delicacy of sentiment, which would not discredit a polished nation. Such is particularly the case with two of their love songs, preserved by Scheffer in his history of Lapland, and which have been repeatedly translated into English. The general character of the Laplanders, indeed, stands higher than that of most of the other Arctic or Antarctic tribes. They are a gentle, harmless, and friendly race, strongly attached to one another, and kind and hospitable to strangers. But they are at the same time indolent and timid, destitute of that energy, which provides for the

¹ The Chinese form an exception to this remark. It appears by the testimony of late travellers, and particularly by the narratives of the recent embassies sent by the British and Dutch East-India Companies, that theatrical exhibitions are a favorite amusement in China, and that the pieces performed have often considerable merit. In Hindostan, Sir William Jones discovered and translated a regular dramatic poem, the *Sacontalo, or Enchanted Ring*; but it does not appear that the exhibitions of the drama were ever common in that country.

gradual amelioration of the social state, or secures even the most ordinary comforts of life.

It must, therefore, be acknowledged, that the high-flown eulogy of Linnæus, upon the happiness of the Laplanders, is somewhat misplaced—"O happy Laplander," says that learned writer, "who, on the utmost verge of habitable earth, liveth obscurely, in rest, content, and innocence. Thou dreadest not the scanty crop, nor the ravages of war, which cannot reach thy shores, while in a single moment they waste and destroy the richest provinces of other countries. Under thy covering of fur, thou sleepest securely, a stranger to care, contention, strife, and envy. Thou hast no danger to fear, but from the thunder of heaven. Thy harmless days slide on in health to extreme old age. Millions of diseases, which ravage the rest of the world, are unknown to thee. Thou livest like a bird in the woods, obliged neither to sow nor to reap, for bounteous Providence has provided for all thy wants."⁴ Such a panegyric, according to Lord Kaines, might with more propriety be applied to an oyster—for, says he, "no creature is freer from want, no creature freer from war, and probably no creature is freer from fear; which, alas! is not the case of the Laplander." (Sketches, b. 2. Sk. 1.)

The manners, pursuits, and amusements, then, congenial to temperate climates, are, in every respect, to be preferred to those natural to climates either of extreme heat or cold. The inhabitant of temperate regions, neither sunk in luxury and effeminacy, like the Asiatic, nor chilled into apathy, like the Greenlander, is fond of active amusement, of the sports of the field, of the recital of the exploits of his ancestors, and of the sublime effusions of genius, in the higher and more instructive species of poetry, music, and song.

Thirdly. The last of those indirect effects which I conceive climate to produce upon human character, is reducible to the head of laws and government. If climate has a sensible influence upon the strength and vigor of the human constitution; if it perceptibly braces or enervates the tone of the mind; if it gives a character to the ordinary pursuits and amusements of a people, it is a natural conclusion, that it will not be without its effects upon their political institutions, their code of laws, and form of government; for these must be chiefly determined by the general character and dispositions of the people.

If the natives of sultry climates be, as we have represented them,

* "O felix Lapo, qui in ultimo angulo mundi sic bene lates, contentus et innocens. Tu nec times abuonæ caritatem, nec Martis prælia quæ ad tuas oras pervenire nequeunt, sed florentissimas Europe provincias et urbes, unico momento, sape dejiciunt et delent. Tu dormis hic sub tua pelle, ab omnibus curis, contentionibus, rixis, liber, ignorans quid sit invidia. Tu nulla nisi discrimina nisi tonantis Jovis fulmina. Tu ducis innocentissimos tuos annos ultra centenarium numerum, cum facili senectute, et summa sanitate. Te latent myriades morborum nobis Europæis communes. Tu vivis in sylvis, avis instar, nec sementem facis, nec metis; tamèn alit te Deus optimus optime." (Flor. Lappon.)

naturally prone to indolence and sensual indulgence, and scarcely susceptible of high intellectual exertion, it is evident that we are not to look among them for the origin of a free political constitution, or the invention of just and equal laws. To obey implicitly the will of another, is but a trifling hardship upon one, whose character is devoid of all energy and activity; who has scarcely a wish beyond those immediate gratifications, with which his prolific soil plentifully supplies him; and who, if he be left in repose, and in the undisturbed enjoyment of the luxuries natural to his climate, has hardly a desire ungratified. Where the necessaries, and even conveniences, of life are so easily obtained, they will naturally be considered as comparatively but of little value. If they are taken away by force, the injury will be looked upon as trivial, and consequently will scarcely be provided for by any adequate institutions. Where the circle of enjoyment is confined to a few gratifications of sense, the varieties of injurious treatment are by no means numerous, and do not demand a complicated system of civil or criminal law, in order that they may be sufficiently guarded against.

In the torrid regions, therefore, we are not to expect a complicated system of political regulations, or well digested codes of crimes and punishments. It is not there that we can look for a people jealous of their rights, and anxious to assert their liberties against the usurpations of the powerful and ambitious. We are rather to expect arbitrary government, a deficiency of just and equal laws, the most unfeeling oppression on the part of the rulers, and the most abject submission on the part of those who are subjected to their sway.

If we examine history, we shall find that such has actually been the condition of those regions from the remotest ages. Among the people of Eastern and Southern Asia, despotic government seems to have been nearly coeval with the world itself. In Babylonia, Nimrod laid the foundation of absolute power in the ages immediately after the flood; and from the little we learn of him, we have reason to believe that his sway was tyrannical and oppressive. All the nations spoken of by Moses, the Assyrians, Elamites, the inhabitants of Palestine, and those who dwelt on the banks of the Jordan, were without exception under the dominion of kings. In Egypt, too, there was an absolute monarch, and we find by the facts recorded in scripture, that his power was but too often exercised in the oppression of his subjects. Even the Israelites themselves, though favored by the lights of divine inspiration, and originally governed by a code of sacred origin, were unable to resist the general propensity of the people around them, and called loudly for a king to rule over them. The kingly government was accordingly established in their country, and continued ever after to prevail in its most oppressive form.

The most ancient nation of the East, of which profane history takes particular notice, is the Assyrian, and there monarchical government was early established in its utmost rigor. What we learn of Belus, of Ninus, and of Semiramis, is entirely conformable to this assertion. Of Ninias, the successor of Semiramis, the ancient

writers have given several particular details, and they sufficiently establish the tyranny of the kings of Nineveh. This monarch, according to Diodorus and Justin, commanded a certain number of troops to be levied yearly, in every province of his empire. With this army he formed an encampment round his capital, by which means he kept his subjects in obedience, and was always ready to chastise the rebellious. He likewise took especial care to commit the government of his provinces to those who were entirely devoted to his person, and each governor was obliged to repair annually to Nineveh, to give an account of his conduct. (Diod. l. 2. Nic. Damasc.)

It is mentioned by Diodorus, that Ninias kept himself continually secluded within the walls of his palace, (l. 2.) as if apprehensive that the awe with which he wished to inspire his subjects should be diminished by too near an approach to his person. He was not, however, of that effeminate cast, by which his successors in the Assyrian empire were so greatly debased; for it is admitted by the ancient historians, that he took care to place good generals at the head of his armies, experienced governors in his provinces, and able judges in his cities; in a word, that he neglected nothing that seemed necessary to preserve order and tranquillity in his dominions, and that he maintained peace during his whole reign.

In the character of Ninias, then, we behold a despotic, but not a cruel or oppressive prince. It is, however, but seldom that absolute power is untarnished by such excesses. Where there is no restraint upon the will, no check upon the caprices of human nature, the baser passions are but too apt to assume an unbridled sway. The history of the Roman emperors will ever afford a memorable lesson of the dangers of excessive power, and will teach enlightened men to wish to live under a limited authority, as the only safeguard against the most wanton cruelty, and the most unblushing profligacy. We read of a Persian vizier, who, every morning when he left the presence of his sultan, used to satisfy himself whether his head stood firm upon his shoulders. A stronger picture can hardly be exhibited of the abject terror which must ever prevail in a despotic government.

Absolute monarchy has, from the remotest ages to the present times, continued to be the only known form of government throughout the extensive regions of the Southern and Eastern world. In that boundless tract, the inhabitants have, from generation to generation, quietly submitted to the arbitrary will of favored individuals, whom enterprise or accident may have elevated to the seat of power. We read, indeed, of many struggles for the succession of a monarchy; of bloody wars, plots, and assassinations, undertaken by rival candidates for a throne; or by some fortunate conqueror filled with the ambition of universal dominion. But we hear of no contests entered into by the people for the defence of their rights against the encroachments of their rulers, no struggles for equal laws and a free constitution, no steady claims of a strict and incorrupt administration of justice.

It clearly follows from this, that submission to absolute authority is entirely congenial to the people of those regions; and is founded

upon causes as permanent as the soil and climate of the regions themselves. A republic, a democracy, or even an aristocracy, are things which have never been heard of among these nations, and the meaning of which it would be difficult to make them understand. "A Venetian, named Balby," says the French collector of voyages to the Indies, "being at Pegu, was introduced to the king. When his majesty learnt that there was no king at Venice, he burst into such a violent fit of laughter, that he was seized with a cough, and was unable for some time to speak to his courtiers." (T. 3. p. 1.) He was probably as much inclined to disbelief as his brother monarch of Bantam, upon being informed that in winter the waters of the rivers in Europe became so solid, that men could walk upon them.

In countries governed by the absolute will of a despot, it is almost superfluous to inquire what were the laws, or system of jurisprudence; for where all must yield to the mandate of an individual, law is rendered absolutely nugatory. From the little that has descended to us concerning the laws, or rather usages, of the regions now under consideration, we are induced to form a very unfavorable opinion of their spirit. We find them severe and oppressive, deficient in the discrimination of the degrees of guilt, and inflicting the heaviest punishments on every kind of crime. We see in very early times, Thamar condemned to be burnt for adultery (Gen. c. 38.); and in the Egyptian laws we find this punishment inflicted not only for adultery, but for much more venial crimes. Among the Israélites, blasphemy, idolatry, profanation of the sabbath, smiting or cursing father or mother, were all punished with death, and even with the most cruel kinds of death. Indeed, we find the ancient penal laws of almost every country, uncommonly severe; and it requires the collective wisdom of ages to render the criminal code, even of a free country, at all conformable to the principles of real justice.

The only polished nations of antiquity, who have been celebrated for legislative wisdom, are the Greeks and Romans: for the legal system of the Egyptians, which has sometimes been famed, was rather a religious than a civil code. It was among the Greeks and Romans too, that republican government was first matured, and that full scope was given to the noblest exertions of the human faculties. These were the favored soils in which freedom first fixed her seat; it was in their temperate climate that she first took firm root, and produced those happy fruits which have been found to spring from her alone. It was there that the world first beheld unshaken patriotism, undaunted valor, and the noblest exertions of intellect in all the departments of science and of art.

But it is not from the example of the Greeks and Romans alone that we infer, that temperate climates are favorable to independence of spirit, security of rights, and the administration of just and equal laws. Among our rude forefathers we shall find the same repugnance at despotic government, as among the inhabitants of Latium, of Athens, or of Sparta; we shall even find a free political constitution well organised and digested; and we can discover the distinct embryo of

64 Inquiry into the Causes of

that admirable system of limited government, which has long been the boast of Britons, and the envy of the world. "C'est d'eux (les Germains)," says Montesquieu, "que les Anglois ont tiré l'idée de leur gouvernement. Ce beau système a été trouvé dans les bois."

The treatise of Tacitus concerning the manners of the Germans amply confirms the truth of this observation. "The Germans," says that writer, "choose their kings, on account of the splendor of their race: their generals, on account of their bravery. But the power of their kings is not unbounded, or arbitrary; and their generals rule rather by example than authority. Affairs of smaller moment are entrusted to the chiefs; but in those of higher consequence, the whole nation deliberates: in such a manner, however, that those matters which depend upon the will of the people, are examined and discussed by the chiefs. If they are not prevented by any emergency, they all convene upon stated days, and generally when the moon changes, or is full. From their unrestricted freedom, this inconvenience arises, that they do not all assemble at once, like men under the influence of command, but sometimes a second or a third day is consumed by the tardiness of those who collect together. They sit down armed, in a promiscuous crowd. The priests command silence; and in them the power of correction is vested. Then the king or principal chief is first heard; and the rest in order, according to their precedence in age, in nobility, in warlike renown, or in eloquence; and their influence arises rather from their ability to persuade, than their authority to command. If the proposed measure displeases, it is rejected by a confused murmur: if it is approved, they brandish their javelins. To assent by arms, is the most honorable species of approbation. In this assembly it is lawful to present accusations, and to prosecute for capital offences. Punishments vary according to the quality of the crime. In the same assembly, also, are chosen their chiefs or rulers, who are to administer justice in the various towns and districts. To each of these are conjoined an hundred persons chosen from the common people, who are to aid them both by their authority and advice."¹

¹ "Reges ex nobilitate, duces ex virtute sumunt. Nec regibus infinita aut libera potestas, et duces exemplo potius quam imperio praesunt. De minoribus rebus principes consultant, de majoribus omnes; ita tamen ut ea quoque quorun penes plebem arbitrium est, apud principes pertractentur. Coeunt, nisi quid fortuitum et subitum inciderit, certus diebus, cum aut inchidatur luna aut impletur. Illud ex libertate vitium, quod non simul, nec jussi convenient, sed et alter et tertius dies cunctatione coenitum absumitur. Ut turba placuit, considunt armati. Silentium per sacerdotes, quibus tum et coercendi jus est, imperatur. Mox rex vel princeps, prout status cuique, prout nobilitas, prout decus bellorum, prout facundia est, audiuntur, auctoritate suadendi magis quam jubendi potestate. Si displicuit sententia, fremitu aspernantur: sin placuit, franeas concintunt. Honorableissimum assensus genus est armis laudare. Licet apud concilium accusare quoque et discrimen capitum intendere. Distinctio pœnarum ex delicto. Eliguntur in insidi concilii et principes, qui jura per pagos vicosque redunt. Centeni singulis ex plebe comites, concilium simul et auctoritas, usunt." (Tacitus de Mor. Ger.)

What an admirable picture is here displayed of manly independence, and a dignified sense of the rights of the lower orders in the state! We here behold the regulation of public affairs, not entrusted to the arbitrary caprice of a single individual, but subjected to the deliberation of the whole people. We behold a due respect paid to rank, to age, or to talents; but we find no servile adulation, no abject submission. We behold, in a word, that republican system of government, which the political sages of ancient and of modern times have so highly extolled; and which required only to be modelled into the representative form, and guarded by proper checks, to constitute that admirable political system, under which we now happily live.¹

It is a melancholy reflection to consider how few are the numbers of our fellow creatures, who have at any period enjoyed the blessings of such a form of government. While the fairest and most extensive portion of the habitable world has, from the remotest ages, bowed under the yoke of arbitrary despots, the benefits of freedom and equal laws have been confined to a very limited space, and have been usually enjoyed but for a short interval by the favored people who have at any time possessed them. So congenial, it would seem, is submission, to the greater part of the human race; so difficult is the formation of a well regulated political constitution; and so hard is it to preserve what is thus ardously acquired.

" Il sembleroit," says Montesquieu, " que la nature humaine se soulèveroit sans cesse contre le gouvernement despotique. Mais, malgré l'antour des hommes pour la liberté, malgré leur haine contre la violence, la plupart des peuples y sont soumis. Cela est aisément à comprendre. Pour former un gouvernement modéré, il faut combiner les puissances, les régler, les tempérer, les faire agir; donner, pour ainsi dire, un lest à l'unc, pour la mettre en état de résister à une autre; c'est un chef d'œuvre de législation, que le hazard fait rarement, et que rarement on laisse faire à la prudence. Un gouvernement despotique, au contraire, saute, pour ainsi dire, aux yeux; il est uniforme partout: comme il ne faut qu'à des passions pour l'établir, tout le monde est bon pour cela." (*L'esprit des loix*, liv. 5. ch. 14.)

It is of little use to enquire what are the laws and form of government which most naturally arise in countries exposed to the extremity of

¹ We find in the laws of the Gothic nations, who overthrew the Roman empire, additional evidence of the advance made by the people of the North in the true principles of legislation. The ancient writers pass the highest encomiums on the administration of the Gothic monarchy in Italy, under Theodosius the Great. His laws were dictated by the most enlightened prudence; and framed, on that benevolent principle which he expressed in his instructions to the Roman Senate. " Bravus principis est, non tam delicta velle punire, quam tollere." It is enacted by the laws of the Visigoths, who obtained a permanent footing in Spain, that no judge shall decide in any lawsuit, unless he finds a law in the written code applicable to the case. The penal laws of this code are generally tempered with great equity. For example, it is enacted that no punishment can affect, the heirs of the criminal: " Omnia criminis suis sequuntur autores, — et ille solus judicetur culpabilis qui culpana commiserit, et crimen cum illo qui fecerit moriatur."

cold. In these torpid regions, the passions are so blunted, and there is so little of intellectual exertion, that laws are scarcely required or thought of. To provide for the bare necessities of life requires a greater effort of industry than the indolent inhabitant of the circum-polar regions is willing to exercise. If this be accomplished, he seeks no further enjoyment than an undisturbed repose amid the smoke of his hut. It is not, therefore, his inclination, either to oppress his fellow-creatures with usurped powers, or to oppose an effectual resistance to the inherited or assumed authority of a chief. Whatever authority is exercised in these inactive regions, is rather of the paternal than the monarchical kind; it is assumed without opposition, and obeyed without repugnance.

In the important prerogatives, then, of laws and government, as in the other particulars that have come under our review, we find that the inhabitants of temperate climates possess superior advantages over the other regions of the earth. It is there only that an equitable system of legislation, and a well regulated political constitution, have usually been found. It is there that the encroachments of despotism have been effectually resisted, and that a permanent provision has been formed for the rights of every order in society, the lowest as well as the highest.

Great, then, indeed, are the privileges which naturally belong to the temperate regions of the earth; for, if the preceding investigations be well founded, we find them excelling those districts which are exposed to the extremes of heat or cold, not only in the natural strength, activity, and temperance of their people; but also in the dignity of the female character, in their habitual manners and amusements, and even in their laws and government.

I shall conclude my observations on this subject with the contrast which Montesquieu has drawn between the inhabitants of temperate and tropical regions. "Il y a, dans l'Europe, une espece de balancement entre les nations du midi et celles du nord. Les premières ont toutes sortes de commodités pour la vie, et peu de besoins; les secondes ont beaucoup de besoins, et peu de commodités pour la vie. Aux unes, la nature a donné beaucoup, et elles ne lui demandent que peu; aux autres, la nature donne peu, et elles lui demandent beaucoup. L'équilibre se maintient par la paresse qu'elle a donnée aux nations du midi, et par l'industrie et l'activité qu'elle a donnée à celles du nord. Ces dernières sont obligées de travailler beaucoup, sans quoi elles manqueroient de tout, et deviendroient barbares. C'est ce qui a naturalisé la servitude chez les peuples du midi: comme ils peuvent aisément se passer de richesses, ils peuvent encore mieux se passer de liberté. Mais les peuples du nord ont besoin de la liberté, qui leur procure plus de moyens de satisfaire tous les besoins que la nature leur a donnés. Les peuples du nord sont donc dans un état forcé, s'ils ne sont libres ou barbares: presque tous les peuples du midi sont, en quelque façon, dans un état violent, s'ils ne sont esclaves." (L'esprit des loix, l. 21, ch. 3.)

BIBLICAL SYNONYMA.

No. iv.—Continued from No. XX. p. 236.

Genesis, viii. 7. AND he sent forth a raven, which went to and fro, until the waters were dried up from the earth.

The raven was one of the oldest constellations, and perpetually occurs on all the marbles on which the Mithraic emblems are engraved. It was indeed in most oriental regions a bird sacred to the sun, and of great request in the mysterious rites of their religion. [Maurice's *Ind. Antiq.* vol. 5. p. 617.]

Genesis, viii. 8. And he sent forth a dove from him to see if the waters were abated from off the face of the ground.

Lucian, in his book *de d. à Syriâ*, mentions three statues in the most holy recess of the temple at Hieropolis, one of which had a golden dove upon its head, which was supposed to have been intended for Noah, there being a variety of circumstances connected with the worship and rites of that temple, which justified the opinion: this dove, it was asserted, flew away twice in a year, at the time of the commemoration of the flood. It may be added, that the dove was so sacred, that pigeons were never eat about Hieropolis. [See Cumberland's *Sanconia*, p. 320.]

Genesis, 3. Eve and the Serpent.

In the Codex Vaticanus, a collection of Mexican paintings, is a representation of the celebrated serpent woman Cihuacohuatl, called also Quilatzli or Tonacacihua, woman of our flesh. The Mexicans consider her as the mother of the human race, and, after the God of the celestial Paradise, Ometeuctli, she held the first rank among the divinities of Auhuac. She is always represented with a great serpent. Behind this serpent, who appears to be speaking to the goddess Cihuacohuatl, are two naked figures of a different color, in the attitude of contending with each other. The serpent woman was considered at Mexico as the mother of two twin children. These naked figures are perhaps therefore the children of Cihuacohuatl, and remind us, as Humboldt observes, of the Cain and Abel of the scriptures. [Humboldt's *Researches*, vol. 1. p. 195.]

Genesis, viii. 21. And the Lord smelled a sweet savour, &c.

It seems to have been a general opinion that the deity was gratified by the fumes arising from burnt offerings. Lucian refers to the wound inflicted on Venus by Diomed, Hom. 5., adding, that the greatest luxury of the gods was, instead of victuals, to suck in the fumes that rise from the victims, and the blood of sacrifices that are offered to them. [Lucian *Icaro Menippus*, vol. 2. p. 225.]

Genesis, xxiii. 16. And Abraham hearkened unto Ephron: and Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he had named in the audience of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant.

This was the most ancient mode of carrying on commerce. There is a curious account in Cosmas (called Indicopleustes) to be found in Maurice's *Ind. Antiq.* of its adoption between the inhabitants of Axuma, the capital of Ethiopia, and the natives of Barbaria, a region of Africa near the sea coast, where were gold mines, which gives us a tolerable idea of this primitive kind of commerce. Every other year a caravan of merchants, to the number of five hundred, sets off from Axuma, to traffic with the Barbarians for gold. They carry with them cattle, salt and iron. On their arrival at the mines, they encamp upon a particular spot, and expose their cattle with the iron and salt to the view of the natives. The Barbarians approach the mart, bringing with them small ingots of gold, and after surveying the articles exposed to sale, place on or near the animal, salt, or iron, they wish to purchase, one or more of the ingots, and then retire to a place at some distance. The proprietor of the article, if he thought the gold sufficient, took it up and went away, and the purchaser also secured and carried away the commodity he desired. If the gold were not deemed sufficient, the Axumite let it remain fixed to the article till either more ingots were added to satisfy the full demand for it, or the first offered taken away. Their total ignorance of each other's language rendered this silent mode necessary, and the whole business terminated in five days, when the Axumite caravan departed homewards, a journey of not less than six months. It was the custom of some Indian merchants, as in fact is still practised in China, to carry a certain portion of gold or silver into the market, and having previously furnished himself with proper instruments and scales, he cut off and weighed out before the vender of the commodity wanted, as many pieces as were proportioned to the purchase of it. [Maurice, *Ind. Antiq.* vol. 7. p. 24. 26.]

Dr. Bell makes the same observation on the Chinese, who, when they have occasion to buy any thing above the value of six pence, cut off a piece of silver and weigh it. [Bell's *Travels*, vol. 2. p. 39.]

Genesis, xxix. 26. And Laban said: It must not be so done in our country to give the younger before the first born.

Thus also in the ancient Hindoo code, it is made criminal for a man to give his younger daughter in marriage before the elder, or for a younger son to marry while his elder brother remains unmarried. [Maurice, *Ind. Ant.* vol. 7. p. 329.]

Genesis, xxxi. 45, 51. And Jacob took a stone and set it up for

▪ pillar. And Laban said to Jacob, Behold this heap, and behold this pillar, which I have cast between me and thee.

In the treaty of Nerthinsk between the Russians and Chinese, the ambassadors of the latter, according to a custom of the earliest date, raised two pillars upon the spot to determine the boundaries of the respective empires, and on them engraved the treaty. [Pennington's *View of India, &c.* vol. 3. p. 183.]

Genesis, xl. 20. And it came to pass, the third, which was Pharaoh's birth-day, that he made a feast unto all his servants.

The following passages, descriptive of the customs of ancient nations, prove the great attention paid to birth-days. Amongst all the Persian festivals, each individual pays particular regard to his birth-day, when they indulge themselves with better fare than usual. The more rich among them prepare on this day an ox, a horse, a camel, or an ass, which are roasted whole: the poorer sort are satisfied with a lamb or a sheep; they eat but sparingly of meat, but are fond of the after dishes, which are separately introduced. [Herod. *Clio.* 133.]

There is not a Chinese, though ever so poor, but keeps his birth-day with all the greatness he is able. All the children, kindred, neighbours, and friends, know every man's birth-day; a mandarins is known by all under his jurisdiction; that of a viceroy or supreme governor by all the province. It is an ancient custom to celebrate birth-days, but not for private persons; nor is it so universal as it is in China. The women keep their birth-days, but the men are never with the women in any rejoicing whatever. [Fernandez Navarette's *Act. of Spain, Churchill's Coll.* vol. 1. p. 71.]

The celebration of the birth-day of the great Mogul is thus described by Sir Thomas Roe. He and all his nobles made merry. I was invited to the ceremony too, and as I drank his health in a noble cup of gold set with emeralds, turquoises, and rubies, he entreated me when I had drunk the wine to accept of the cup as his present. There were several chargers of rubies and almonds made in gold and silver, which were brought in and thrown amongst the nobles and them that stood about him. His majesty appeared in all the height of pomp and richness of dress that day, and his elephants were set out in all their most glorious furniture too: they all passed before him in great order, and bowed very handsomely to him as they marched along, which, all things considered, I thought one of the finest and most agreeable sights that day afforded. [Harris Coll. vol. 1. p. 166.]

Exodus, ii. 3. And when she could no longer hide him, she took for him an ark of bulrushes, and daubed it with slime and with pitch, and put the child therein; and she laid it in the flags by the river's brink.

We learn from Strabo, lib. 17., and all antiquity, that boats made of reeds and the Egyptian papyrus were used very early.

Sic cum tenet omnia Nilus
Conseritur bibula Memphytis cymba Papyro. *Lucan.*

From Lucan also it appears that boats nearly similar were very early in use amongst the Venetians and Britons.

Primum cana salix madefacto vimine parvam
Texitur in puppim cæsoque inducta iuvenco
Vectoris patien tunidum superent et munem:
Sic Venetus stagnante Pado; fusoque Britannus
Navigat oceano.

Pliny mentions some boats used by the Ethiopians, which he calls Plicatiles, because, he says, they used to fold them up together, and carry them upon their backs, whenever they came to a cataract; and such, Herodotus tells us, were used by the Babylonians: his words are,—*Of all that I saw in this country, next to Babylon itself, what to me appeared the greatest curiosity, were the boats. These, which are used by those who come to the city, are of a circular form and made of skins. They are constructed in the parts above Assyria, where the sides of the vessels, being formed of willow, are covered externally with skins, and having no distinction of head or stern, are modelled into the shape of a shield; lining the bottoms of these boats with reeds, they take on board their merchandise, and thus commit themselves to the stream.*

A boat much resembling this is constantly used on the Severn and Wye, called a coracle.

The Cahites, a South American tribe, were remarkable for using boats, the fabric of which was something between thatch and wicker work, being of a long and strong kind of straw, knit to the timbers. These they made large enough to carry ten or twelve persons. [*Southey's Brazil*, p. 44.]

Exodus, iii. 5. *And he said: Draw not nigh hither, put off thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy ground.*

This custom is practised by the Sianiese when they approach their princes and governors, to whom a deference, amounting nearly to adoration, is paid; an observant traveller mentions it in his audience before the berklam or chancellor of Siam: we turned towards the house where he gives public audience, and appears with all his pomp and splendor. We ascended a stony staircase, and then polled off our shoes. [*Kanpher's Japan*, vol. 1. p. 17.]

At Asnere in India, is the tomb of Hodgee Mundee, the great Indian saint. The sepulchre, with the buildings about it, is a very

noble thing ; it is as rich and fine, as a prodigal, blind zeal and superstition might be supposed to make a thing, for which it expresses the highest respect. You pass three large courts before you come to it, the first of which is near an acre of ground; and is paved with black and white marble; the others are proportionably large, but the nearer the sepulchre, the more extravagant the pomp and glory of them. There is such an opinion of the sanctity of all these places adjacent to the tomb, that no person dares walk there without a naked foot ; you must be quite bare, or not pretend to tread any part of these hallowed courts. [*Finch's Travels in India, Harris Coll.* vol. 1. p. 89.]

In the description of a public triumph in Mexico, the same observance is noticed. "The victories gained were so great, that the rejoicings in Cusco on that score lasted a month. There were of all the several conquered nations there to grace the ceremony, and bear a part in the entertainment ; they all appeared in their several different habits, and with the martial music used in their respective countries ; they were divided into so many distinct bands and troops, which marched in order after the Inca and the generals to the temple of the Sun. All the rest put off their shoes, when they came to the boundaries of the temple, only the Inca himself kept his on till he came to the very door, where he made his feet bare, and then went in, and gave thanks for the mighty victories he had gained." [*Harris Coll.* vol. 1. p. 782.]

When Montezuma delivered himself to Cortes, he was accompanied by two hundred lords, drest in a style superior to the other nobles, but bare-footed, two by two, keeping close on each side to the walls of the houses, to show the respect they bore to their sovereign. [*Cullen's Mexico,* vol. 2. p. 64.]

And when Cortes with his four captains and a few soldiers went to pay their respects to Montezuma, we are told, that after passing through three courts and some halls to the east antichamber, in order to come at the hall of audience, they were politely received by several lords who kept guard, and were forced to put off their shoes, and to cover their pompous dresses with coarse garments. [*Cullen's Mexico,* vol. 2. p. 70.]

Exodus, iv. 15. And thou shalt speak unto him, and put words into his mouth ; and I will be with thy mouth, and with his mouth, and will teach you what ye shall do.

Among the Egyptians, says Mr. Bryant,¹ Moses was styled Alpha, or more properly Alphi, which signifies the mouth or oracle of God. We are indebted to Ptolemy Hephestion for this intelligence : his words are, " Moses, the lawgiver of the Hebrews, was called Alpha."

¹ *Bryant's Plagues of Egypt, 248.*

Exodus, viii. 3. And the river shall bring forth frogs abundantly, which shall go up and come into thine house, and into thy bedchamber, and upon thy bed, and into the house of thy servants, and upon thy people, and into thine ovens, and into thy kneading troughs.

The people called Autariats were forced, by frogs bred in the clouds, which poured down upon them instead of rain, to forsake their country and fly to those parts where now they are settled. [Diod. Sicul. b. 3. c. 2.]

Exodus, viii. 17. And Aaron stretched out his hand with his rod, and smote the dust of the earth, and it became lice in man and in beast; all the dust of the land became lice, throughout all the land of Egypt.

In Diodorus Siculus, there is reference to the destructive effects produced by lice upon the body. Talking of the Acriophages, he says, as the manner of their death is strange and wonderful, so it is sad and miserable. For when they grow old, wicked lice breed in their flesh not only of diverse sorts, but of horrid and ugly shapes. This plague begins first at the belly and breast, and in a little time eats and consumes the whole body. He that is seized with this distemper first begins to itch a little, as if he had the scab, pleasure and trouble being united. But afterwards, when the necr begin to break out in the skin, abundance of putrid matter, accompanied with intolerable sharp pain, issues out with them. Hereupon the sick person so tears himself in pieces with his nails, that he scabs and groans most lamentably; and while he is thus scratching himself, the lice come pouring out in such abundance, one after another, as out of a vessel full of holes, and thus they close and end his days. [Diod. Sic. b. 3. c. 2.]

Exodus, xii. 2. This month shall be unto you the beginning of months, it shall be the first month of the year to you.

The North American Indians begin the year at the first appearance of the first new moon of the vernal equinox. According to the ecclesiastical year of Moses, and the synodical months, each consist of 29 days, 12 hours, and 40 odd minutes, which make the months alternately to consist of 29 and of 30 days. They pay a great regard to the first appearance of every new moon, and on the occasion always repeat some joyful sounds, and stretch out their hands towards her, but at such times they offer no public sacrifice. The Indians name the various seasons of the year, from the planting or ripening of their fruits; the green-eared moon¹ is the most beloved, when the first fruits become sanctified, by being

¹ The month Abib was, on the institution of the Passover, constituted the first month of the Jewish sacred year; the meaning of Abib is, the green corn.

annually offered up. And from this period they count their beloved or holy things. [Adair's *American Indian*, 76.]

Exodus, xxv. 37. *And thou shalt make the seven lamps thereof; and they shall light the lamps thereof, that they may give light over against it.*

The idol of Lingam, a deity similar to the Phrallus of the Egyptians, is always to be found in the interior and most sacred part of the temples of Siva. A lamp is kept constantly burning before it, but when the Brahmins perform their religious ceremonies, and make their offerings, which generally consist of flowers, seven lamps are lighted, which De la Croze, speaking from the information of the Protestant missionaries, says, exactly resemble the candelabras of the Jews, that are to be seen in the triumphal arch of Titus. [Sketches of the Hindoos, vol. 1. p. 203.]

In his account of a bass relief, descriptive of a sacrifice to the Sun, discovered by M. Savary¹ upon a rock near the town of Babran in Egypt, he informs us that before the divine object were three wood piles, sustained by seven vases with handles bearing slain lambs. And M. Montfaucon in his Antiquities mentions an image of Mithras, near which were seven altars, flaming to the honor of that deity. It should be observed, that the sun was worshipped by the Persians under the name of Mithras, and by the Phoenicians under the name of Baal.

E. S.

A PASSAGE in CICERO'S CATO MAJOR illustrated.

"Omnino canorum illud in voce splendescit etiam nescio quo pacto, in senectute." Cic., de Senect. c. 9.

THE only notes upon this passage in J. G. Grævius's excellent edition, published at Amsterdam in 1688. 8vo., are these. "Canorum illud in voce—De quo Cic. 3. de Orat. Est autem in dicendo etiam quidam cantus obscurior, non hic e Phrygia et Caria Rhetorum epilogus, pœne canticum; sed ille, quem significat Demosthenes et Aeschines, cum alter alteri objicit vocis flexiones." J. G. Grævius. "Quinetilianus, ubi de pronuntiatione agit, dicit vocis naturam spectari quantitate et qualitate. Quantitas est simplicitas; in summa enim grandis, aut exigua est. Qualitas magis varia est: nam est aut candida, aut fusca; et plena, et exsilis; et

¹ Savary's Letters, vol. 1. p. 446.

lenis et aspera; et contracta, et fusa; et dura, et flexibilis; et clara, et obtusa. *Canorum* vocem claram; clarior enim tum sit, cum obtusa splendescit." Aldus Manutius.

J. C T. Euesti, in the *Ler. Technolog. Lat. Rhetor.* Lips. 1797^o 8vo. p. 46., thus explains *canorum*: "Vox *canora* maxime in virtute ponitur, oratorisque perfecti propria dicitur a rhetoribus, qui et *canorum* oratorem laudant, ubi de præstanti voce et actione sermo est. Sic Cic. Or. 3,7. in Carbone *profluens* quiddam et *canorum* laudat, quorum illud ad expeditam suavemque orationis copiam, hoc ad concinnitatis eam suavitatem pertinere videtur, que cum pronuntiandi modulandique jucunda varietate conflueta sit. Vid. Brut. 88. et 92. ubi, cum concursus hominum sonique strepitus dicantur desiderare *canorum* oratorem, patet magnam vocis claritatem intelligi, quæ nullo strepitu obruatur, sed eum penetret et sua vi superet. Sic Spartianus Pescennium Nigrum ita *canoræ* vocis fuisse dicit, ut in campo loquens per mille passus audiretur. Enimvero idem Cicero vocem *cunoram* (*Offic.* 1. 13. 7.) ita commemorat, ut in vitio esse videatur. Ibi de Catulis, *Sine contentione vox nec languens, nec cunora*, ubi pro tunnula accepit Heusingerus, recte quidem, si cantum quendam trenulum cogitavit et firma intentione carentem, ut est apud Quintil. 11. 3. 55. Non dubito illorum verborum eundem sensum esse, qui Cassiodori Lib: de *Ahima*, ubi describens hominem virtute et sapientia præditum, vox ipsa, inquit, mediocris, nec debilis vicino silentio, nec robusta clamore dilatata. Quavis in loco Ciceronis illud etiam vocis vitium cogitari velim, quo ille propter modulationis affectationem, ad mollem quendam cantum accedit. vid. quæ ad voc. *Cantus* diximus. Ceterum in *canoro* veteres non solum præstantiam et splendidam claritatem, sed et suavitatem et elegantiam auribus jucundam cogitasse, patere videtur ex Horat. *Art. Poet.* 321. ubi *ungæ canoræ* dicuntur versus, non rebus ac sententiis, sed solis elocutionis ornamenti, numero, concinnitate etc. excellentes: cf. Cresoll. *Vacatt.* Lib. 5. p. 484."

That *canorum* in the passage of Cicero *de Senectute* means, not "magnam vocis claritatem," but "suavitatem et elegantiam," is apparent from the context, and scope of the passage—"Orator metuone **LANGUESCAT** in senectute; est enim munus ejus non ingenii solum, sed **LATERUM** etiam et **VIRIUM**. Omnia canorum illud in voce splendescit etiam nescio quo pacto in senectute: quod equidem adhuc noui amisi, et videtis annos: sed tamen est **DECORUS SERMO SENIS QUIETUS, ET REMISSUS**, facitque persæpe ipsa sibi audientiam diserti senis **COMTA ET MITIS ORATIO**."

As to *splendescit*, Cicero does not appear anywhere else to use the verb *splendescere* in this sense. Nizolius quotes this passage, and the following from the preface to the *Paradora*—"Nihil est tam horridum, tam incultum, quod non *splendescat oratione*, et tan-

quam excolatur." But here it cannot escape the reader's sagacity that the words *splendescat oratione* are not used in the same sense, in which we have "canorum illud in voce splendescit." I have examined the dictionaries of Basil Faber, of J. M. Gesner, and of Ægidius Forcellinus, or Jacobus Faccioli, both under *canorum*, and under *splendescere*, and they have no remarks upon this passage in the *Cato Major*, nor do they cite any similar use of *splendescere* from any other writer. But λαμπρὸς in Greek is applied to the *voice*, and when it is so applied, it seems always to denote *loudness* and *distinctness*.

I find that, in the *Index Demosthenæ Gracitatis*, Reiske notices these passages, Καὶ τὸν βεβιωμένον αὐτῷ βίον αὐτίκα δὴ μάλι ἔρει λαμπρῷ τῷ φωνῇ: Again, τίνα δὲ φθέγγεσθαι μέγιστον ἀπάντων, καὶ σαφέστατ' ἀν εἰπεῖν ὅ, τι βούλοιτο, λαμπρῷ τῷ φωνῇ: Αἰσχίνη οὖθ' ὅτι τουτονί. Both occur in the περὶ παραποσθ. p. 403. l. 16. and p. 405. l. 16. Thus we have in J. C. T. Ernesti's *Lex. Technolog. Gr. Rhetor.* (Lips. 1795. 8vo. p. 194.): "λαμπροφωνία, clara, sonora vox. Phot. Bibl. c. 265. p. 1474. Oppositum est τὸ ισχυρόφωνον. vid. Plutarch. Vit. Dec. Rhet. in Isocrate, cui eodem sensu Philostratus Soph. p. 504 τὸ ἐλληπὲς τοῦ φθέγματος tribuit. vid. voc. λευκός. *Splendorem vocis*, fortasse ex eadem metaphora commemorat Cicero Brut. 71. Sic et Plin. l. 20. 6. s. 21. de porro, *Voci splendorem affert*. Cf. Cies soll. Vac. Aut. l. 3. p. 482. Polybius l. 1. p. 63. οὐδιος καὶ λαμπρὸς ἄνεμος. Georop. l. 12. 15. διὰ τὸ τοὺς Ἐτησίας ἀνέμους λαμπρὸν ἐπιπνεῦσται ἐπὶ πολὺν χρόνον: ubi J. N. Niclas: "Λαμπροὶ ἄνεμοι Atticis sunt fortes, magna vi aliquo incumbentes: vid. Dorvill. ad Charit. p. 114. ac mox hic n. 84. πνευσοῦντι δὲ καὶ Ἐτησίας λαμπρῶς, et 38. ἐν τῷ ἔπει πνέουσιν ἄνεμοι Ζέφύροι λαμπροὶ."

But Aristotle *Poet.* 24. uses λαμπρὰ λέξις for *dictio ornata*, as we use *splendid diction*, and the Greek rhetoricians in the same sense use λαμπρὰ νοήματα, λαμπρότης λόγου.

In the sense of *splendid diction* Photius, *Bibl. Cod. 6. de Gregor. Nyss.* beautifully says, τὴν φράσιν λαμπρὸν, καὶ ἡδονῆς ὠσὶν ἀποστάζων. It is however to be remarked that Sophocles in the *Œd. Tyr.* 481, ed. Sophoc. Eton. 1786. p. 32. uses the verb as applied to the voice.

Ἐλαμψε γάρ τοῦ νιφάσεντος
ἀρτίως φανεῖστα
φάρα Παργασοῦ.
τὸν ἀδηλον ἄνδρα πόντ' ἵχνεύειν.

Here the Scholia substitute ἐδήλωσε as a gloss to explain ἐλαμψε, clumsy enough. But it is here equivalent to *came forth, issued forth, the oracle commanded, &c.* The passages of Pliny and Cicero (*in Bruto*) referred to above by Ernesti, are quoted by

Forcellinus, and decidedly mean "claritas." "Splendor vocis," says Forcellinus, "est claritas et canora suavitas." Cic. in *Bruto*, c. 68. et 71. *Actio ejus habebat et in voce magnum splendorem, et in motu summam dignitatem.* Plin. I. 20. c. 6. *Porrum tactuum voci splendorem adserit, καθαίγε τὴν ἀγρηγίαν, inquit Diocor. I. in. c. 179.*"

But in the passage, which we are discussing, *splendescit* does not mean *claritas*, and this is apparent from the context (as I observed above with respect to *canorum*,) for Cicero indirectly explains his *Canorum illud in voce splendescit* by *sermo quietus et remissus*, and *comta et mitis oratio*, and these words are incompatible with the sense of "claritas" as applied to *canorum*, or to *splendescit*. "Omnino," says he, "canorum illud in voce splendescit etiam, nescio quo pacto, in senectute; quod equidem adhuc non amisi, et violetis annos: sed tamen est decoris sermo sensis quietus et remissus, facitque persæpe ipsa sibi audientiam diserti sensis *comta et mitis oratio*."

As to *nescio quo pacto*, that implies no doubt of the fact, but merely states that the case is so somehow or other, and the phrase *somewhat or other* as used by us sometimes implies that we are ignorant of the cause, and sometimes implies simply that we really believe the case to be so, but do not choose to give to ourselves the trouble of thinking how it comes to pass, and in this latter sense I understand the *nescio quo pacto* in the passage under consideration.

The following translation, or paraphrase, of the passage has been proposed: "Omnino, 'to speak generally,' *canorum illud*, 'that musical sweetness, which we so much admire in the voice,' *nescio quo pacto*, 'a thing I cannot account for,' *splendescit etiam*, 'becomes even more clear and more dignified,' *in senectute*, in 'old age.'"

From what I have said above the reader will infer that I understand *splendescit* to mean neither "claritas," nor "suavitas," (for "suavitas" is meant by *canorum*,) but Cato means to say that. *Canorum illud* 'continues,' 'exists' in old age: *splendescit* is only a strong and vivid expression, and is used simply for *est, inest, manet*, or some analogous verb, as in the passage of Sophocles quoted above. Ελάμψε signifies 'the oracle declared, commanded, charged,' or some other analogous idea. The force of the sentence is in *etiam*—*Etiam in senectute*, 'even in old age.' Cato did not mean to say that *canorum illud* is a necessary concomitant of every voice in old age, but that, where this quality of the voice ever exists in *youth*, it

is not NECESSARILY lost in old age; — it may be supposed, and he seems to intimate that old age rather mellows than destroys it, and he quotes himself as a living example of the truth of the remark— “*Omnino canorum illud splendescit etiam, nescio quo pacto, in senectute; quod equidem adhuc non amisi, et videtis annos.*” But the “principal doubt about the justness of the translation or paraphrase mentioned above arises from hence: that experience does not seem to confirm the truth of Cicero’s observation.” But I have already answered this remark by saying that Cato does not say that “old age necessarily mellows the voice, and attunes it to harmony,” but he intimates that, where there has ever in early life existed anything of a mellow and harmonious voice, it is not necessarily lost in old age, however much the “*latera et vires*” may fail. The misconception appears to be in supposing that Cato meant, to say that this musical property of the voice is its necessary concomitant in old age, which is so far from being true in point of fact, that old age gives to some voices harsh and disagreeable tones; and this, as I suppose, is what is intended by the words that “experience does not confirm the truth of Cicero’s observation.”

Hatton, April 2, 1814.

E. H. BARKER.

ANSWER

To Mr. Bellamy's Essay on the Hebrew Points, and on the Integrity of the Hebrew Text.

No. III.—Continued from No. XXI. p. 118.

I THINK that we may esteem it very probable, that a MS., written in the Rabbinical character, must, generally speaking, have been transcribed by a Jew: and if this be admitted as a satisfactory evidence of their origin, we shall soon find a great number of our MSS. to be really Jewish; besides many others of which we can ascertain the proper classification by their history.

Another and much stronger proof of the family to which a MS. belongs may be discovered generally, in the date. When the date is given according to the Jewish calculation, it may, I should conceive, be safely referred to the Jewish class.—There is still another

evidence respecting a MS.; namely, the *Masora*. Where the *Masora* is written in the margin, there surely can be no doubt that the copy containing it is a genuine copy: and this will go far to prove the authenticity of most of the MSS. collated by Dr. Kennicott. It is a curious fact that his Cod. 28., which has a double Latin version, and the Lord's prayer, twice written in Hebrew at the end, and which there is reason to believe was transcribed by some Christian, or, perhaps, some converted Jew, has neither date nor *Masora*.

I have not insisted upon the Codices Hebraeo-Latini, because it is not exactly known what they really are: that the greater part of Dr. Kennicott's collection, however, are genuine copies, there cannot be a moment's doubt. Many of them carry with them a certificate of their birth. For example, Cod. 76. "scriptus fuit a Rabbi Menahim in usum Rab." עַקְבָּן הַקְדֹּשֶׁ ר' שְׁלֹמֹה ex Grenoble, in civitate S. Arnould, A. M. 5056.—A. C. 1296.¹ In Cod. 89, "constat Colophon linei 14. scriptis rhythmicè; et linea 8. ultimae dant acrosticè nomen scribè עַקְבָּן הַלְּלִי qui codicem vel punctavit, vel perfecit."²—There is one MS. more to which I shall particularly call the reader's attention; Dr. Kennicott's Cod. 99., of which he gives the following account: "parum adest *Masora*. Libri 3 poetici scribuntur hemisticè; at, ordine forsitan singulati, exaratur *Ruth* inter *Psalmos* et *Jobum*. Codex noster, etsi non inter antiquos numerandus, argutias *Masoreticas* de literis minusculis, &c. (Gen. ii. 4.; xxiii. 2. &c.) saepius corrigit; et plurimas voces abnormes emendat: ut bis in Gen. xviii. 24. טָרֵךְ וְצָדִיקִים et הַצָּדִיקִים. Dicitur in fine, codicem scriptum esse a Jacobo ben Rab. Josephi de Riphullo, pro R. Isaaco ben R. Juda de Tholosa, h[ab]c Salsonæ, an. mundi 5145: i. e. an. Christi 1383. Haec descriptio nunc paginam exornat titularem; et hac paginâ aversâ, legitur codicis hujus *historia*, a testibus 5. comprobata. Affirmat Titulus—Codicem hunc esse sanctissime Hierosolymorum civitatis *Synagogæ* dicatum et consecratum. Affirmat insuper *historia*—quod Turea, deprædatâ *Synagogâ* Jerusalem, eo quod infelix natio *Judæorum* argentum sibi impositum exsolvere potis haudquam fecerat, sacrum hunc librum eo majori abstulerunt aviditate, quo majori cupiditate *Judæi* retinere conabantur, ut pretiosissimam *Thesauri* sui supellectilem."³ In Dr. Kennicott's catalogue there are a great number of Jewish copies, which I now enumerate. They are numbered as follows: 376, 377, 378, 379, 380, 381, 387, 388, 408, 409, 410, 411, 412, 413, 414, 415, 416, 423, 424, 425, 426, 427, 428, 522, 523, 524, 546, 547, 554. (belonging to the public library of the Jews at Mantua :)

¹ Dissert. Gen. p. 77.

² Ibid. p. 79.

³ Ibid. pp. 79—80.

556, 558, 561, *⁵⁷⁰, 571, 572, 573, 574, 575, 578, 579, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 636, 637, 638, 639, 640, 641, 642, 643, 668. (belongs to the Chinese Jews:) 671. A. B. C. D. E. (five rolls, each containing the Pentateuch, belonging to the Synagogue in Duke's Place:) 672. A. B. C. (three rolls, each containing the Pentateuch, belonging to the Synagogue at Bevis Marks.) Fourteen of these, viz. 377, 379, 423, 425, 428, 546, 570, 571, 574, 636, 637, 638, 639, 642. read חסידך Ps. xvi. 10: to these must be added 2. and 99: five only read הפסידך; viz. 409, 410, 523, 572, 579: 575 was not collated in the Psalms; and the other MSS. mentioned, do not contain the Psalms.—Out of 272 copies collated either in whole or in part, 180 have חסידך in the text; among these authorities is the Talmud of Babylon, which twice quotes Ps. xvi. 10. and in both citations, * in all the editions reads חסידך: and also the Keri printed in Vander-Hooght's Bible: 664 should be reckoned as more than one authority, because it consists entirely of variations quoted by Houbigant “ex codicibus non descriptis.” חסידך was originally the reading of three copies, which have since been altered, and is now the marginal reading of four authorities.

This, I think, affords strong evidence, that Jewish, and therefore genuine, copies still exist; and it is equally true that these copies by no means agree among themselves.—Hence, therefore, Mr. B.'s assertion, that, on examining “the authorised copies in use among the Jews, which have been handed down to them from the time of their dispersion,” we shall “find that they all agree; there are no different readings, consequently they must be the same as the autograph of Moses,”² evidently is incorrect: and thus both his principal reasons for believing in the integrity of the Hebrew text fall together.

It is also true that the Rabbinical writings frequently supply us with various readings.—Let us compare a few citations from 650. B. (the Babylonish Talmud,) with the text of Vander-Hooght.

Vander-Hooght's edit.

Ps. xv. 1. מֵ

xvi. 10. לֹא תַתְנַ

חָסִידָךְ

Talmud.

וּמֵ

ולֹא תַתְנַ

חָסִידָךְ

¹ “De Codice 562. agit in Dissertatione MSta Jacob Saraval, doctus Judaeus Mantuanus; qui disertis verbis ait, *Varietatum lectionis, in MSto. magno numero reperiendam, ex consensu, cum antiquis versionibus dijudicandam esse.*” Kennicott Dissert. Gen. p. 105.

² Talmud. Bab. T. ii. tract. Erubin. fol. 19. Tom. iii. tract. Goma. fol. 87.

³ Class. Journ. No. xviii. p. 407.

Vander-Hooght's Edit.

Ps. xvi. 11. את

xvii. 14. צפינך

xxiv. 6. דרשו

xxxi. 6. פריתה

xxxv. 15. לא ידעתִ

xxxix. 13. first אל

cxliv. 10. אף זנחות ותכלימנו

— 24. אל

xlvii. 7. אלהים

— 8. כל

xlix. 15. וצידם

li. 6. בשפטך

lxv. 11. תלמיה

— גדוריה —

lxviii. 13. מלבי

lxxii. 17. נין

— 18. עשה

— נפלאות —

lxxiv. 4. מועד

— 11. חזק

Talmud.

omitted; all other authorities retain it.

צפונך

דורשו

פריתה with many other authorities.

omitted.

אל

הלא ארעה אלהים זנחתני 650 H. (Jerusalem Talmud)

650 B. alone

many other authorities.

many authorities.

בשפטיך

תלמי 650 H.

נדוריה many authorities.

מלאי

נון

עשה

נפלאות נדולות

מועדיך

חזק

On the subject of the Talmudic readings, I shall only further produce the opinion of Dr. Gill, by whom they were examined. He had formerly said that the Talmudical variations were few in number, but after having collated them he changed his opinion and confessed his mistake. “*Jam retractandum erit, quod regomet ipse affirmari, et alii ante me, ‘nimirum, vel nullas vel perpaecas reperi varietates a textu vulgato, in Talmude hinc illuc allegatis; et hasce nullus, saltem levis esse momenti:’ quum constet ex precedenti collatione, discrepantias esse tautum non mille.*”¹

It is certain, also, that various readings were occasionally collected by the Jews themselves. *Rabbi Ben Chaim*, in the preface to the great Rabbinical Bible printed at Venice by Bomberg, has these words: “*Viri Synagogæ magnæ invenerunt libros inter*

¹ Apud Kennicott, *Dissert. Gen.* p. 16.

se differre . et in loco, ubi invenerunt dubitationem et confusionem,
adscribabant unum, sed non punctabant ; vel adscribabant margini,
sed non in textu , quia fuerunt dubii de eo quod invenerunt."¹

Sed missa hac faciamus

We rest the argument on other grounds —The text of the New Testament certainly is far removed from a state of absolute integrity or perfection To go no farther, we have a most convincing proof of this in the case of the controverted verse, 1 John v. 7 It is not my intention to enter again into the merits of that question , but I may remark, that, whichever side of the question be true, still a corruption must somewhere exist If the text be genuine , it must follow that all the MSS. and versions must be corrupted, because in those it is omitted if it be spurious, the printed editions must be interpolated, because in them it is contained From one of these inferences there is no possible way of escaping and then a second inquiry is to be made why should either the MS. or the printed text be permitted to be corrupted either by omission or addition ? Neither does the question stop here Both the Jewish and Christian Scriptures are undoubtedly sacred , and having been both " given by inspiration of God , are equally entitled to his miraculous and divine protection How happens it, then, that they are not both placed upon the same footing ? Why should one be committed to the care of Man, while the other is retained under the more immediate guard of Heaven ? Why should that protection be withheld from the Scriptures of the Christian, that is so liberally granted to those of the Mosaic covenant ? and why should God have so visibly watched over the revelation of his inspired prophet, while he seems not to have guarded the gospel of his Son ?

These are all obvious and fair questions . Nor is the answer to them very easy, while we defend the integrity of the Hebrew text : when we yield that, every thing becomes easy, all difficulties vanish, and all inconsistencies disappear Nor need we fear that we by open too wide a door to infidelity the doctrinal integrity of the text will still remain, though the literal integrity may be untenable. It is merely the doctrinal integrity of which we stand in need if we show, as we certainly can do, that with regard to doctrine, the text is precisely in the same state as when delivered by Moses or by Christ, we still have sufficient ground on which to prove the divine origin of our faith All genuine parts of Scripture are retained in a number of copies fully sufficient to prove them so and when a passage is destitute of such support, it does not become unreasonable to consider it as spurious Nor can the rejection of a passage ever militate against the doctrine it

¹ Rab Ben Chaim in Pr. at ap. Kennicott *Dissert Gen* p 10

contains; for the wisdom of the Almighty has ever ordained that no doctrine essential to salvation should ever rest upon a single passage. Even if 1 John v. 7. be spurious, the doctrine of the Trinity remains undiminished in strength; because it is unequivocally declared in so many Texts, and may be logically deduced from so many more, that the addition or omission of the passage will make as little difference in the Trinitarian controversy, as would a single drop of water, taken from, or added to, the waves of the ocean.

For my own part, I may be permitted to say, that I regard the corruption of the text as one of the strongest arguments for the truth and divine inspiration of the Scriptures. This may, at the first view, seem a paradox; but it appears on a second and more deliberate examination to be founded in fair reasoning. It is apparently conceded on both sides, that, whatever may be the state of the Hebrew Text in a literal point of view, it is certainly entirely pure as far as relates to matters of faith, and instructions in morality: if then, it be still perfect in this sense, while it is corrupt in the other, it will surely follow, that by some providential care the doctrine has been preserved, while the other parts have remained in the care of men: and it will easily be granted that this care would not have been extended to it had it been an unhallowed imposition on the world.

It is now high time that I should conclude: but before I close my letter, I request Mr. B. to believe that I entertain a sincere respect for the rectitude of his intentions, and that on the main point, the truth and divine authority of the Bible, I cordially agree with him: and should it be attacked, he will find many abler assistants in defending it, but can never have a more zealous and sincere coadjutor. How far I have succeeded in defending Dr. Kennicott's side of the question must be left to your judgment and that of your readers: but that the integrity of the text must be proved by other arguments than those which Mr. B. has made use of, seems very plain. Had it been probable that any others of your correspondents would have taken the trouble to address you upon Mr. B.'s article, you would not have been troubled with these remarks. "Quenvis—hoc mallem de iis, qui essent idonei, suspicere, quam me; me, ut mallem, quam neininem." [Cicero, *Orat. in Q. Cæciliūm.* s. 5.]

Aug. 12, 1814.

M.

P. S. I wish to add a few particulars respecting a Masoretical edition to which I have already alluded; but which it would then have been foreign to my purpose particularly to mention. This edition is denoted in Kennicott's work, by 300. It was printed at Mantua, 1742—1744, and is generally known by the name

כָּנַחַת שׁ: and although the text for the most part agrees with that of the other editions, “comprehendit—varias lectiones supra 2000, corrogatas ex MStis et edit. impressis, a Judæo eruditissimo, nomine *Jedidiah Solomon, Menorzi seu ex familiâ Norzi.*” *Dissert. Gen. p. 27.* In the preface a pathetic account is given of the difficulties under which the Jews at present labor; “nec minima datur luctus hujus causa, quod sacri eorum libri multâ adhuc egeant emendatione, quam tamen facile nancisci non possint.” *Dissert. Gen. p. 27.*—“desolatus est omnis pius et consternatus; dum intelligit, quod abierit manus, et **ERRORES MULTPLICATI SINT.** nec est cuiquam curæ cordique, ut citò afferat medicamenta. Quis restituet decus? — Quis collocabit nobis signa in literis? Quis ejiciet raphanos et spinas? Quis dubit ut conscribantur voces et signantur, secundum emendationem in libris perfectis?”¹ There are also many parts in which the multitude of various readings greatly perplexes the author: he remarks on Prov. vii. 25. in the following manner: “Erravit cor meum, horror confudit me; quum viderem multitudinem variantium, quæ ceciderunt in libros! Omnes nos tanquam oves erramus; quilibet ad suum suam respicit: neque est qui docet cognitionem, et judicat secundum normam. Is. liv. 1. Ego autem sedeo desolatus; quum video multitudinem diversitatem, quæ ceciderunt in libros: et valde malum hoc mihi factum videtur. Quia singulis diebus continuantur, et multiplicantur; et editores eunt obscurati, neque lux est eis: neque est qui indagat, neque est qui querit cessationem hujus diversitatis!” On Zach. xi. 5. he has the following note: “Diversitates multas vidi in aliis libris, et harum tandem me cepit: quare abscondidi faciem meam ab illis.” He goes still farther in a note on 2 Kings xviii. 29.: “Libri, in quibus scriptum **כִּיְדֵי**, sequuntur filios Babylonis; sed secundum filios terræ Israelis (quibus nos innitimus in varietatibus Bibliorum) scribitur **כִּיְדֵו**. Quis potest emendare quod **PERVERSERUNT SCRIBÆ, ET TYPOGRAPHI, A DIEBUS ANTIQUIS?**—Ecce nos palpantes tanquam cæci in obscuritate diversitatem; nec prosperam facimus viam nostram, ad inveniendum desiderium nostrum. In tribus libris antiquis impressis sic **כִּיְדֵי**, sicut inveni in uno correcto MSto Hispanico: at in alio MSto **כִּיְדֵו** tamen in margine notatur, alia exemplaria habere. — Non est in potestate mea decidere. Deus auferat tenebras nostras; ut oculi cœrorum, caligine et tenebris obducti, videant.”² — In quoting the notes of this edition, Dr. K. marks them by 300: when he cites the text, he makes use of the mark 300. T. Let us now extract a few of the principal readings of this edition, and occasionally compare them with other Jewish copies.

¹ J. S. Menorzi Praefat. ad כָּנַחַת שׁ op. Kennicott. *Dissert. Gen. p. 27.*

² Ibid.

84 *Different Latin Poetical Expressions*

Text of Vander Hooght.	Cod. 300.	Readings of other Copies.
Ps. i. 1. וּבְמִשְׁבַּח	T. 2. 99.	לְמָה שְׁנָאת כָּל 650 H.
שְׁנָאת כָּל v. 6	בֵּיתֶךָ	
— 8. בֵּיתֶךָ	T. 2. 99.	
vii. 5. שְׁלֹמִי	וַיְגַנְּקִים	99.
viii. 3. שְׁלֹמִי	עַל מִות	
ix. 1. אֶל	הַגְּדוּ	2. 99.
— 12. הַגְּדוּ	דְּרָכָיו	2. 99. 650 B.
x. 5. דְּרָכָיו	לְחַטְּפָה	2. 99. .
— 9. לְחַטְּפָה	וּמִ	650 B.
xi. 1. נָדוּ		נָדוּ 650 B.
xv. 1. זָהָה		omitted in 650 B.
— — מַיִם		650 B.
xvi. 10. לֹא		וְלֹא 2. 650 B.
חַסְדִּיך —		2. 99. 650 B. with many others.
xvii. 5. אֲשֶׁרְיוֹ	אֲשֶׁרְיוֹ	2.
— 14. צְפִינָךְ		צְפִינָךְ 650 B.

It is but fair to acknowledge that the edition in question appears to be more unprolific in various readings in the Psalms, than in the other parts of Scripture: but I select the early Psalms chiefly for the sake of giving more of the Talmudical readings, than I could do in the body of my letter.

On the different LATIN POETICAL expressions to render the ENGLISH verb TO RUN.

IT is well known that some of the greatest poets have been in the habit of writing their verses in several different ways, before they could express themselves in such a manner as to meet with their own approbation. The rough copy of Pope's Homer, now deposited in the British Museum, affords an unequivocal proof of this circumstance. Virgil is reported to have sometimes written a great number of verses, which, on correction, he afterwards reduced to few; but this may perhaps mean nothing more than the different forms of expressing the same ideas, from which he particularly selected those which appeared to be the most felicitous, appropriate, and elegant. His poems afford internal evidence of unwearyed labor and application. They are the most correct, and the most

artificial, perhaps, in any language, and exclusively of the matter which I am not now to consider, the perfection of the numbers is such, that they never could have been the extemporaneous and unrevised effusions of even the highest and most extraordinary gifts of the human intellect. I appeal to any scholar of taste, if on reading Virgil for the hundredth time, he will not still discover something new; some of those very minute and critical points both in the matter and the style, which will then excite his admiration. I have also seen some variations of the Italian poems of Petrarch, in which many of the lines seem to have been originally expressed in several different ways. The versification of that poet ranks as high in Italian, as that of Virgil in Latin. Their numbers are indeed the standards of perfection in their respective languages, a characteristic for which those poets were undoubtedly indebted to their taste, their accuracy, their skill, and their application. Indeed I believe that if we could trace the private literary history of every other poet, we should find his case to have been the same, and that his most beautiful passages were precisely those which he had re-written the oftener, and which had cost him the most pains in revision.

The poetical spirit of ideas is the exclusive gift of nature, and therefore unattainable by art; but the excellence of metrical combinations is the result of skill and copiousness of diction. Hence poets have generally chosen that particular language, in which they could most easily, and most fully, express their own sentiments. The copiousness of every dialect is not, however, the same, and there are sometimes defects against which neither art nor genius can afford an adequate remedy. But the Latin, from which I am going to give an instance, does not labor under any such disadvantages. Its copiousness is immense, and a real scholar can never be at a loss in it for suitable expressions. I am an enthusiastic admirer of the Roman muse, but I trust that it is an attachment founded on her intrinsic merit. I had lately occasion to turn the following English words into a Latin distich—*A spirited horse runs.* Of course the thought consists of three distinct ideas,—horse—spirited—and running.

Insigni captus meritæ dulcedine palmae |
En! festinat ovans | pulverulentus equus.

I was not pleased with the way in which, at first, I versified the last idea, and which is included in the first hemistich of the second line. I tried again, I was not satisfied, and I made the hemistich a third time.

My theory is, that the poet should go on versifying the same thing over again, until he has produced something good; and hence a thought struck me to make an experiment on the copiousness of poetical Latin expressions, and to ascertain in how many various

ways the action of running might be described in the first penthemimer, without altering the former versé, or the conclusion of the distich. Great and extensive as are the resources of Latin phraseology, I was astonished at the result. My success exceeded my most sanguine expectations, and it filled me with admiration, that without seeking for any uncommon expressions, exerting any particular labor, or even materially departing from the meaning of *to run*, I found that in about an hour I had translated it in poetical Latin, in nearly forty different ways. Encouraged by this unexpected success, I have since seriously endeavoured to carry it on still further, and I have now to offer considerably above *one hundred* variations of the same meaning. The subject, however, is not exhausted, and such is the superabundance of the Latin idiom, that it is impossible to say to what an extent the expression might not be still modified.

It is an indispensable qualification to become a good Latin poet, to be an elegant scholar, and a man-of genius; and it is, therefore, an accomplishment which can be possessed but by few. But this great variety of diction, while it perplexes and even misleads the unlearned, affords an incalculable assistance to the skilful versifier. What cannot come into metre in one way, will come in another. The facility, which in a few instances has been acquired in writing Latin verse, is amazing, and there have been persons who could compose in it nearly as fast as they could have done in Latin prose. Such a facility is the necessary consequence of having a great variety of expressions at command; and hence it has been generally acknowledged, that supposing an equal skill in English and Latin versification, that of the former is the more difficult.

Vida observes that the poverty of the Latin language, of which Lucretius complained, had long ceased to exist. I am doubtful whether any other language could be found, in which the same idea could be expressed under so many different forms. In Greek, on account of its copiousness, it might perhaps be done. As to French, it is the most impoetical of all languages. I do not believe that there is so much variety in English or in Italian; and if I am not mistaken, there is not either in Spanish or Portuguese.

The variations which I am going to offer, only affect the former part of the second line, in which, for the connexion of the sense, the use of a verb is indispensable, together with some other word depending upon it, so as to fill up the hemistich. If it were not for this circumstance, the variations might be still more diversified. There is no doubt also that the whole couplet might be as much varied in its composition, as the hemistich in question.

The difficulty which is so often experienced in composing Latin verse does not really exist in the thing itself, but in the incapacity of the versifier. Since this is, therefore, the natural inference, it is

not less so on the contrary, that the facility of Latin verse affords a most ample encouragement for the exertions of the poet in that language. He ought to persevere in making the same verse over again, until he has been particularly fortunate in the structure of it; and he ought also never to overlook one single careless, inelegant, vulgar or inappropriate expression.

This great variety has also the advantage of enabling persons who have but a moderate acquaintance with Latin, to frame tolerable verses with the assistance of the *Gradus*. If they know but the common rules of metre, and can remember only a few of those numberless expressions, they will be able to make them scan together into verse,—and that will be sufficient. The greater number of Latin verses at this time, (though by the way not the best) are those done in schools, sometimes under very indifferent masters, and that too only with a view to acquire a knowledge of Latin quantity. Considering it, however, as a more scholarlike and more elegant exercise, I would suggest that instead of requiring young persons to bring a certain number of verses, they should be encouraged to exhibit the same thought so many times versified, under a different form and inflection. This would introduce them to a more intimate acquaintance with the language, by compelling them to think more on their subject, and to take in a wider range of expression.

Something of the kind, though in a very imperfect degree, obtains in some seminaries, where the odes of Horace are given as exercises, to be turned into elegiac verse.

It is, however, unnecessary to give directions, where nature has denied the existence of poetical powers, or where a want of taste does not permit them to be called into action. Nor is that alone sufficient. The poet must not be in a state of uncertainty about his daily subsistence: he must have leisure, and he must be free from all the cruel anxieties of the mind, before he can acquire that total abstraction, which is necessary for the cultivation of his favorite pursuit. Some of the latter poems of Ovid have been severely criticised, as if they betrayed evident marks of carelessness, and as if his intellectual powers had been sinking fast into decay: I am so far from agreeing in this opinion, that I consider the *Tristia* as one of the proudest monuments of human genius. Those elegies, I own, might perhaps in several passages have been more correct, but taken all together, they still exhibit the wrecks of a mighty mind, which it had not been in the power of misfortune and persecution to overwhelm, and which appears venerable, like a ruined edifice, which still raises its bold front, as if to attest at once the fury and the impotence of the pitiless storm. It is rather astonishing that the Roman poet, when placed in such circumstances, should have been able to write at all, and that that vigor of mind which was

only impaired, should not have been totally extinguished by despair and insanity. The Tristia were composed by the poet with the view of softening, since he could not forget, the recollections of an accumulation of calamities—the loss of his home, his fortune, and his friends—those friends whom he complains to have basely forsaken him by joining in the cry of persecution, and by trampling upon him in the hour of his distress. Still like what is reported of the palm tree, he rose superior to the pressure which would have crushed him to the ground; and his celebrity has survived, when the names of his oppressors are either forgotten, or only remembered in execration.

This is the summary of my reasons for admiring the Tristia; the very same reasons in substance which the poet himself repeatedly employs to excuse the inaccuracies of that work. It is, therefore, indispensably necessary, that whoever wishes to cultivate poetry, should not only be entirely absorbed in that most delightful of all studies, but that his own mind should be free from every kind of anxiety; for the contrary instance of Ovid is more to be considered as a singular and uncommon exception, or rather moral phenomenon, than to be expected to be found in every individual, who is similarly situated.

Insigni captus meritæ dulcedine palmæ, (Spirited)

En! festinat ovans (Runs) pulverulentus equus (Horse.)

Varia lectiones.

Hinnit ut excurrit pulverulentus equus.—Per campos fertur p. e.—Currit rura super p. e.—It per strata viæ p. e.—Fert per rura pedes p. e.—Pervenit ad metam p. e.—Sæpe revisit agros p. e.—En! currit stadio p. e.—Currere gaudet agris p. e.—Vix pede tangit humum p. e.—Spargit humum pedibus p. e.—Stare loco nescit p. e.—Jam parere negat p. e.—Ore lupos mordet p. e.—Fræna indignatur p. e.—Sponte sua fertur p. e.—Rectorem spernit p. e.—Quam velox agitur p. e.—Ante alios rapitur p. e.—Prævertit reliquos p. e.—Non calcaris eget p. e.—Putre solum pulsat p. e.—It rapido cursu p. e.—Non paret domino p. e.—Exsuperat cursu p. e.—It medius turbæ p. e.—Non cessurus abit p. e.—Carpere gestit iter p. e.—It quacunque viâ p. e.—Hostes proculcat p. e.—Carpit anhelus iter p. e.—Tergo dabit nunquam p. e.—Visere rura solet p. e.—Per salebras tendit p. e.—Martis sinuat strepitum p. e.—Carcere primus abit p. e.—Dat sese comitem p. e.—Flectitur in gyrum p. e.—Tergo fert equitem p. e.—It citiore gradu p. e.—Pone volat cursu p. e.—Nil remoratur iter p. e.—Nolueritvinci p. e.—Carpit iter solitum p. e.—Ardet inute viam p. e.—Dat volitare jubas p. e.—Turpe putat viuci p. e.—Haud requiem patitur p. e.—Præterit obstantes p. e.

—Primus adest cursu p. e.—Gloria fertur equum p. e.—Curruculo vincit p. e.—Exultat spatio p. e.—Non segnis sequitur p. e.—Ægrè fert vinci p. e.—Assuescit circo p. e.—Arva videre cupit p. e.—Curiat hic illuc p. e.—Expatriatur agris p. e.—It pede veloci p. e.—Festinat campus p. e.—Colla humore madet p. e.—Festinare potest p. e.—Transmittit campus p. e.—In campum tendit p. e.—Calceo fuit terram p. e.—Spumas oris agit p. e.—Ore reluctatur p. e.—More fugit venti p. e.—Turbinis instar abit p. e.—Cogitum ad cursum p. e.—Signat humum pedibus p. e.—Signa pedum fuit p. e.—Vix gramen tangit p. e.—Verbere non agitur p. e.—Nunquam detecit p. e.—Hinc vnes sumit p. e.—Ore nitemens proficit p. e.—Ocyus ire solet p. e.—Attingit metum p. e.—Decurrit spatium p. e.—Egreditur castris p. e.—Insequitur lepoles p. e.—Fulmina Martis amat p. e.—Propter iter sudit p. e.—Arma ducesque vebit p. e.—Bella cruenta colit p. e.—Solvitur ex stabulis p. e.—Eminet ante alios p. e.—It reddit in gyrum p. e.—Emetitur iter p. e.—Venatu assuescit p. e.—Non timidat iter p. e.—Ambit certamen p. e.—Ire per arva petit p. e.—Sponte volare solet p. e.—Ocyor evadit p. e.—Assequitur primos p. e.—Pone alios linquit p. e.—Fessus abire negat p. e.—Corripit inde gradum p. e.—Primus habet metum p. e.—Nescit habere parem p. e.—Exercet cursum p. e.—Nunquam fessus erit p. e.—Custodes fallit p. e.—Usque vagatur agns p. e.—Pascui læta legit p. e.—Centum lustrat agros p. e.—Nescit ubi iustat p. e.—It celebrante gradu p. e.—Poseit iter siemitu p. e.—Curiat Olympias p. e.—Cum domino vineit p. e.—Non renigunt campum p. e.—It quo fert animus p. e.—Ingeminat gressus p. e.—Accelerat campo p. e.—Arduus arva quatit p. e.—Non cessare potest p. e.—Vi magnâ erupnit p. e.—Sæpius excurrat p. e.—Passibus incedit p. e.—Martis it in Campum p. e.—Nititur ire foras p. e.—Quam citè transit agros p. e.—Infert se medium p. e.—Ut cursus iterat p. e.—Rursus init campum p. e.—Rura superbus obit p. e.—Contendit cursu p. e.—Certat ovans plausu p. e.—Fine coronatur p. e.

Such are the variations which are now offered, but which, if it should be necessary, might still be extended to an indefinite number. There are here *one hundred and thirty-three* various readings in addition to the original one, all of which convey a distinct meaning of the running or speed of a horse.

D.

Bodmin, Cornwall, March 8th. 1815.

On the words φθορὰ, διαφθείρειν, διαφθορὰ, καταφθείρειν, καταφθορὰ, συγκαταφθείρειν, applied to the Illustration of several Passages in the Greek Tragedians, and Prose Writers, with Strictures on a Note in Mr. BLOMFIELD'S Edition of the PERSÆ OF ÆSCHYLUS.

ἀλλ' ἀμφ' Ἀθήνας πᾶς κατέφθασται στρατός.

Aeschylus Persae. 722.

“ Λέπθαρται Ald. Turn. et recentiores. κατέφθασται Rob. K. et Colb. i Mosq. Viteb κατέφθαστο M. I. Supra 235. Ήσ εν μιᾳ πληγῇ κατέφθασται πολὺς” Ολθος. 351. Ἀλλ’ ὅδε δεῖμαν τις κατέφεισε στρατόν. Infra 735. Ήδε παρεπήδην οὐ λαὸς, πᾶς κατέφθασται δορί. Porro διαφέι-
γειν in sensu perdendi non usurpatum, cum potius significet corrum-
pere, ut in Agam. 934. Illeceb. 601. Hippol. 391. Bacch. 318.”
Blomf. in *Gloss.*

Mr. Blomfield is perfectly accurate in reading *κατέφθαγται* for *διέφθαγται*; and the three passages, which he has quoted from this very play, appear decisive. But I am far from thinking with him, that *κατέφθαγται* is to be preferred to *διέφθαγται*, because “*διεφθείσειν* in sensu *perdendi* non usurpatur, cum potius significet *corrumpere*.” For we shall soon see that *διεφθείσειν* is much more frequently used by the best writers in the sense of *destruction*, than in that of *corruption*. I read *κατέφθαγται* for a reason, which is founded upon the propriety of language, and which reason seems not to have occurred to Mr. B., that *καταφθείσειν* is employed by the purest writers to denote *universal destruction*, the destruction not of individuals, but of whole armies, a whole multitude, a whole people. So it is employed by Aeschylus in the three passages adduced by Mr. B. from this very play.

351. Ιλλ' ᾧδε δαιμῶν τις κατέφθειρε στρατόν.

735. Ὡδὲ παμπήδην δὲ λαὸς πᾶς κατέφθαρται δορί.

225. Ως ἐν μιᾷ πληγῇ κατέφθασται πολὺς

"(1) β_{05} ."

In the last passage, the epithet πολὺς will serve to convince Mr. B., that Aeschylus, even in the metaphorical use of the word, has retained its proper notion of *number* or *multitude*. So too in the passage under consideration.

αλλ' αὐτοῖς Αθῆνας πᾶς κατέφθασται στρατός.

Thus we have in Sophocles *OEd.* T. 331.

ἵμᾶς προδοῦναι καὶ καταφεύγειν πόλιν.

¹ Mr. B. here gives a wrong reference—for the passage does not occur in 1825; nor have I been able to find where it does occur.

We have in Euripides, *Ion.* 1235.

λεύσιμοι δὲ καταφθοραὶ

i. e. *lapidatio*. Here we may retain the proper meaning of the word, by understanding *death occasioned by a multitude of stones poured down upon him or them*. In the Septuagint translation of the Old Testament, the word frequently occurs in this its proper sense. Es. xxiv. 1. Κύριος καταφθίσει τὴν οἰκουμένην ὅλην. Es. xiii. 5. καταφθίσαι πάταν τὴν οἰκουμένην. Gen. vi. 17. ἐπάγω τὸν κατακλυσμὸν καταφθίσαι πάταν σάρκα. 2 Macc. v. 14. ὅκτω δὲ μυριάδες κατεφθάρησαν. In Es. xlix. 19. ἔργημα σρῆ καὶ κατεφθαρμένα sc. χωρία, κατεφθαρμένα denotes complete *devastation*. Exod. xviii. 18. Θορῷ κατεφθαρήσῃ καὶ εὐ. καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος. See Biel's *Nov. Thes. philolog.* Here I may be permitted to remark that καταφθίσειν in the Septuagint sometimes occurs in the sense of διαφθίσειν, *corruptere*. Gen. vi. 12. εἶδε Κύριος ὁ Θεὸς τὴν γῆν, καὶ ἦν κατεφθαρμένη, corrupta: ibid. κατέφθισε πᾶσα σάρξ τὴν ὕδων αὐτοῦ, corrupterat omnis caro viam suam. 2 Par. xxvii. 2. καὶ ἔτι ὁ λαὸς κατεφθίσετο, et populus amplius corruptus erat. We have in Jud. ii. 19. διέφθειραν (sc. τὰς ὁδοὺς αὐτῶν) ὑπὲρ τὸν πατέρας.

In the N. T. καταφθίσειν is not, as it should seem, once used in its proper sense of *corporeal destruction*, but is applied metaphorically to the *mind*. “ Speciatim et metaphorice, erroribus et vitiis animum imbuo: sic legitur in N. T. 2 Tim. iii. 8. ubi commemorantur homines κατεφθαρμένοι τὸν νοῦν, quorum animus ita perversus est, ut veritatem agnosceret et sequi nequeat. De depravatione mortuorum καταφθίσειbus reperitur in vers. Alex. Gen. vi. 12. 2 Paral. xxvii. 2. Suid. καταφθορά ὁ ἐν ἀνομίᾳς βίος καὶ παραβάσις. Perdo, disperdo, sive corporaliter (Jes. xxiv. 1. Gen. vi. 17. 2 Macc. v. 14.) sive moraliter, miserum reddo et infelicem, et speciatim de patinis peccatorum usurpatur. Sic autem reperitur 2 Petri ii. 12. ἐν τῇ φθορᾷ αὐτῶν καταφθαρήσονται, per impietatem suam summam sibi contrahent miseriam, seu, perversitatis suae aliquando gravissimas Deo pœnas dabunt. Saepius non legitur in N. T. Lev. xxvi. 39. καταφθαρήσονται εἰὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας αὐτῶν. Suid. καταφθορά ὁ αἰώνιος θάνατος, quæ glossa pertinere videtur ad Ps. xlvi. 9. ubi videndum Theodoreetus.” Schleusner *Nov. Lex. Gr. Lat. in N. T.* The noun καταφθορά does not occur in the N. T. Lucianus *Timon.* V. I. p. 148. ed. Reitz. ἡδυπαθεῖα καταφθίσεις, where, however, as Reitzius says, “ Διαφθίσεις J. (Junt.) Marg. A. W. (Aldimæ Primæ Wesselingii),” and I should prefer διαφθίσεις, because for καταφθίσεις in this sense, I have seen no better authority than the Septuagint, and the N. T. in the places just cited. “ Ps. xlvi. 9. ζήσεται εἰς τέλος, οὐκ ὥψεται καταφθορὰν, vivet in finem, non videbit corruptionem. Ps. xv. 10. et Act. xiii. 35. Sir. xxviii. 6. μνήσθητι τὰ ἔσχατα, καὶ παῦσαι ἔχθραίνων, καταφθορὰν καὶ θάνατον, καὶ ἔμμενε εἰς ολαῖς.” Biel. “ Διαφθορά, speciatim putrefactio, cui obnoxium

est corpus humanum. Act. ii. 27. οὐδὲ δώσεις τὸν ὅσιόν σου ἰδεῖν διαφθορὰν, neque cultorem tuum sines putreficeri, (coll. Ps. xvi. 10.) ii. 31. οὐδὲ ἡ σᾶξη αὐτοῦ εἶδε διαφθορὰν, nec in putredinem abiit. ibid. xiii. 34. μηχέτι μέλλοντα ὑποστῆσθεν εἰς διαφθορὰν, ita ut nunquam moriatur, ibid. v. 35—37. Ναριός non legitur in N. T." It deserves to be noticed that, though καταφθορά is used in the Septuagint in the sense of "death," yet in the N. T. it is never so used, but διαφθορά is the word employed.

Mr. B. with his usual candor will not, I am persuaded, hesitate to admit the propriety of this remark on the word καταφθείσειν, as denoting *universal, total destruction*, supported as it is by the examples already produced; and in Zonaras, Phavorinus, and Suidas, he will see additional reason for adopting the opinion, which I have endeavoured to establish. Phavorinus: Φθορά ἔστι, κίνησις ἀπὸ τόπου εἰς τόπον ἡ φθορά ἔστιν ἡ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος, ἐπὶ τῷ μὴ ὃν μεταβολή· λέγεται δὲ παρὰ τὸ φθίσθαι ράον, ὅτι σήπεσθαι εὐχερῶς· ἡ φθορά ἔστι λύσις καὶ διάλυσις τοῦ κατὰ σύνθετον συγκειμένου πράγματος.

Zonaras, φθορά· ἔστι κίνησις ἐκ τοῦ ὄντος εἰς τὸ μὴ εἰναι. Again, Zonaras, and Phavorinus: φθορά· ἡ διάλυσις τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος. διαφθορά, ὅταν ἀλλη οὐσίᾳ δι' ἐτέρας ἀφανίζεται, ὥσπερ τὸ σῶμα ἀπὸ τῆς σκληρᾶς καταφθορά, ἡ παντελής ἀπόλεια. Suidas and Phavorinus have the following words—διαφθορά· θάνατος, διάλυσις τοῦ συνθέτου σώματος. The words, which follow these, as Kuster tells us, are not to be found in the Ed. Mediolanensis, and two of the Paris MS., and in the third Paris MS., they are written in the margin: they should be compared with the passage in Zonaras, of which I have just cited a part: φθορά· διαφθορά, καὶ καταφθορά· καὶ φθορά μὲν ἔστι σωμάτων νέκρωσις, καὶ ἀπίνησία τῶν ὄργάνων τοῦ σώματος, τῆς ψυχῆς ἀπὸ τούτων χωρισθείσης. διαφθορά δὲ, διάλυσις σώματος, καὶ παντελῶς ἀφανισμός, καὶ σκληρῶν κατέβοωμα· καταφθορά δὲ, οἱ αἰώνιοι θάνατοι, ἡ παγανούματι, καὶ παραβάσεις, καὶ ἀνομίας ὡς τὸ, Οἱ λαὸς ἐφθάρη ἢ ἀνομίας, καὶ φθορὰν μὲν ὑπέστη τὸ τοῦ Κυρίου σώμα, διαφθορὰν δὲ οὔ. Suicer in the *Thes. Eccles.* is silent about the words φθορά, διαφθορά, καταφθορά. Zonaras, under the word διέφθορεν, has preserved a verse of Eupolis, ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ, where both the prepositions κατὰ and διὰ are joined to the word φθείσειν,

ὅτι τὰ πατρῷα πρὸς σὲ καταδιέφθορα·

δροτον γάρ ἔπτι τὸ διέφθορε·¹ τῷ κατέπορε καὶ ἀπέκτονε. I have

¹ " Thom. M. Ἀπεκτονηκάλλιον ἡ ἀπέκτεινα· ἀπέκτανον δὲ αἰδόμενον πάντη. Libanius. T. i. p. 810. C. 832. Corrigendus Phavorinus, qui ἀπέκτανεν (ἀπέκτονεν) Ἀττικῶς ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀπέκτεινεν: add. Idem v. ἀπέκτονα: Suid. v. ἀπέκτινονσι." Witterus, Sallieius, and Stoererus, however, have referred to instances, where ἀπέκτινα occurs in Lysias, in the Αelian, who wrote the *Par. Hist.* in Plato, and in Xenoph. Mœr. Attic. Ἀπέκτονεν, Ἀττικῶς· ἀπέκταγμα, Ελληνικῆς. " Attici, in primis Xenopho, præteritum medium

further to remark, that the word καταφθίσειν is a word of very rare occurrence. It occurs in Sophocles only once. In Beck's Index to Euripides we have only the noun κατάφθορα. In Kuster's Index to Aristophanes the word is not to be found, nor is it to be met with in Herodotus, or Xenopho; nor have I been able to find it in Hippocrates. In the Index Lucianicus it is mentioned only once. In the *Choeph.* 209. we have φευνῶν καταφθορά.

Let us now consider whether Mr. B. be correct in his notion that “διεφθίζειν in sensu perdendi non usurpatum, cum potius significet corrumpere, ut in *Agam.* 934. *Hecub.* 601. *Hippol.* 391. *Bach.* 318.” It is very easy to disprove this unqualified assertion upon testimony, which he himself will scarcely fail to admit. Phryni-

ἀπέκτονα usurparunt pro activo ἀπέκτακα, vel ἀπέκταγκα, ut διέρθορα pro διεφθάρκοις, quanquam altero ὀτεκτονα etiam uti sunt. Vetus Grunniatus ap' Suid. Ἀπεκτακασι καὶ ἀπέκτονασι Μισοῦσι μὲν, ἀπέκτησι, Θρασωνα, ἀπεκτακασι δ' οὐ, quia in v. ἀποκτίνεις repetuntur, et procul dubio εἰ τετρι Conicis deponita sunt Ἀπεκτακασι λεγονται ap' Isocratem *Panathen.* nov. ed 1 n. p 211 Recit a Tayloro restitutum Lysia *contra Theonem.* p. 173.; nec tamen eidem adseretur *contra Agorat.* p. 232. ἀπέκτεινε pro ἀπεκτακε reponenti Rectius scribis ἀπεκτακε, et sic in Eurip. *Rheso* 978. legendum pro ἀπέκτεινε. Ap' Thom. M. forte scribi debet ἀπεκταγκα σε αδόκιμον πάντη, quod 2 Reg. iv. 2 occurrit.” J. Piersomus. With the conjecture of Pier somus all scholars will be satisfied Phrynicus Σοφιστ. Προπαγασκ. ap. Bekkerum *Anecd.* G. v. 1. p. 35 Διεφθορεν: οὐ τὸ διεφθαρται τοῦτο σημανει. δικαιοσύνησιν οἱ λεγοντες Διεφθορεν δὲ πᾶς, δεον διεφθαρται τὸ δὲ ὅφθορε τὸ διεφθαρε σημανει. So Bekker has given the words, but, as Stoeberus in the notes on Thom. M. v. διεφθορεν tells us, Sallierius read διεφθορεν, διεφθαρται σὺ ταῦτα συνινει, and so I read myself before I consulted Staber's note. Thom. M. διεφθορεν αὐτὶ τοῦ ὁφθαρη Λουκιανὸς ἐν τῳ Ἡέκτῃ οὐ καὶ Ἀσκη πιον διοιγηγην 'Τηρ' ἀν ροῦ διεφθορεις τὸ σῶμα· ἄπαξ δε, αὐτὶ τοι ζῆθις· Σοφιστῃ, ει Ἡλέτεια (317.)

τὰς οὔσας τέ μοι

καὶ τὰς ἀπούσας ἐλπίδες διέφθορεν.

But two other instances are quoted by Moschopulus, who is cited by Stoeber l. 1 ex edit. Nicos Διεφθόρεις θόρος τὸ μαρτύριον, οὐ τὸ διεφθαρμενον. Αἰστοραγες εἰς Κορασις Διεφθόρεις τὸν οὖν γηῶν. Μεταχνήσος ἐν Λαδελροῖς. Εἴτε τις τὴν κορυγη διεφθορεις ε. τ. λ. See Phrynicus in v. διαφθείρομαι, and in v. εῖ, δι, αἴτη. Σοφιστ. Διεφθ., -ι. οὐ τὸ οιενθαρται δηλοῖ παρὰ Ἀττικοῖς, σι λα τὸ διεφθαρκεν. Εὔπολις,

*Ος τὸν νευνίσκων συνῶν οι-θροε—

κοὶ ἐν Αὐτολύκῳ,

ὅτι τὰ πατρῷα πρὸς σὲ καταδι-θροε.

ἴσιοιο γάρ ἐστι το διεφθορεις ι καταστοσι και απεκτονει. Ειγμ. M. p. 754. l. 25 το λεγοντα και τέρψαδι, ἔνεγι, τικη εχει σημασιαν το δι τέθηπα και διεδορα, πληθηκη, οι αιτοι γαρ σχηματισιν, και ἐπι ἐνεργητικοτ λοιποσιται και ετι ταβιτικοτ Thus we see that Thomas Magister was mis taken in confining to Sophocles the active sense of διεφθορει.

ēthus Σοφ. Προπαραστ. διέφθορεν, διέφθαρται οὐ ταυτὸ σημαίνει· διὸ καὶ ἀμαρτάνουσιν οἱ λέγοντες· Διέφθορεν ὁ παῖς, δέον διέφθαρται.

Sophocles.

Œd. Tyr. 446. "Ηδὲ ήμέρα φύσει σε καὶ διαφθερεῖ.

Philoct. 507. χ' ὅταν τὶς εὐ ξῆ, τηνικαῦτα τὸν βίον σκοπεῖν μάλιστα, μὴ διαφθαρεῖς λάθη.

Aj. 1305. Λαβῶν ἐπακτὸν ἄνδρ' ὁ φυτεύσας πατίς,
Ἐφῆκεν ἐλλοῦς ιχθύσιν διαφθοράν.

Euripides.

Fon. 544. *Iw.* "Οδὲ ἔκτεθεὶς παῖς ποῦ στιν; εἰσορὰ φάσι;

Kg. Οὐκ οὐδὲν οὐδεῖς ταῦτα καὶ μαντεύομεν.

Iw. Εἰ δὲ οὐκέτ' ἔστι, τίνι τρόπῳ διεφθάρει;

Herc. Fur. 458. "Ἐτεκον μὲν ὑμᾶς, πολεμίοις δὲ θρησάμην
Τβρισμα, καπίχασμα, καὶ διαφθοράν.

Hippol. 1353. Διά μὲν ἔφθειρας, κατά τ' ἔκτενας.

Iphig. T. 719. "Ατάρ τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ γ' οὐ διεφθορέν σέ πω
Μαντεῦμα. καὶ τοὶ γ' ἔγγυς ἔστηκας φόνου.

Hec. 796. "Ος εἰς σ' ἀνελθῶν, εἰ διαφθαρήσεται,
Καὶ μὴ δίκην δώσουσιν, οἵτινες ξενοῦς
Κτείνουσιν —

Hippol. 1434. Καὶ σὺ παραινῶ πατέρα μὴ στυγεῖν σέβειν,
Ἴππόλιτ· ἔχεις γάρ μοισαν, η διεφθάρης.

Iphig. T. 1023. Οἱ μοι διεφθάργμεσθαι πόνοις σωματείμεν ἀν:
“Διαφθίζειν, interficere, A. 4. 1, 8. ἐκινόνευσεν ἀν διαφθά-
ρηναι πολλὰ τοῦ στρατεύματος. 7. 7, 22. μὴ διαφθαρεῖν εὐ
τῇ στρατιᾷ, ne opprimeret. E. 2, 1, 21. Φλοκλῆς στρατηγὸς τούτους
διέφθειρεν. q. l. Leuncl. male explicabat de animorum depravatione.
4. 4. 11. διεφθίζοντο, peribant. 7. 4, 19. αὐτὸς αὐτὸν διεφθίζεται. I. 3.
3, 8. ὑπὸ γυναικῶν τυράννους διεφθαρμένους. Sic feræ dicuntur homi-
nei διαφθίζειν, II. 1, 4, 7. Ag. 1, 22. Eodem modo Socrates Σ.
4, 52. verba hominis Syracusani, διαφθῆσαι παῖδα, intelligere vole-
bat. Sed ille intellexerat de re venerea: cf. sect. 53. συγκαθέδειν.
Etiam Latini ita utuntur suo corrumperere. v. Herald. Advers. 1. 11.
—διαφθίζειν, quoique modo nocere, perniciose lədere, corrum-
pere, ut urhem et artes direptione, II 7. 2, 4. et 5.—A. 7, 2, 2.
στράτευμα διαφθειρόμενον dicitur exercitus ob varias sententias dis-
persus." LEX XENOPHONI. I. XX. Intt. Mich. ii. 10. ἐνεκεν
ἀκαλαρσίας διαφθίζεται φθορά, occidione occisi estis.

Thus then I have proved that διαφθίζειν is used not only by the purest Attic prose writer Xenophon, but by the tragedians Sophocles and Euripides, "in sensu perdendi," which Mr. B. denies, and I shall proceed to show that he is not quite correct in his language, when he says that it is not used "in sensu per-
dendi, cum potius significet corrumperere, ut in *Agam.* 934. *Hecub.*
601. *Hippol.* 391. *Bacch.* 318."

In the *Classical Recreations*, p. 252—9. and 486—8. I have shown that φθείγειν, διαφθείγειν, and φθορά are often employed by painters to denote “the mixture of different colors,” and I have there cited several instances of this technical use of the words.

“ Hæc sibi *corrupto* casiam dissolvit olivo :
“ Et Calabrum coxit *vitiato* murice vellus.”

Persius, *Sat.* ii. 64.

“ Unguentum curat conficiendum e casia præsertim nigra, pretiosissimum. Omnia autem unguenta fiunt *matio* olivo; nam oleum est materia apta suscipiendis odoribus servandisque: itaque in oleum transferuntur ab unguentariis: recte autem *corrupto*: quicquid enim desinit illud esse quod suit, *corrumpi* dicitur: olim Lacedæmonii cum unguentarios urbe pellerent, criminis loco objecerunt, quod oleum disperderent: ergo etiam mixtiones, quales fiunt a myrepstis et pictoribus, sunt ἄροτραι: neque aliter pictores loquebantur, ut usurpat Plutarchus in *Symp.* viii.: sic μιάντειν dixerunt pro μιγνύειν, et μιάντειν pro *mitione*, ut disputant Plutarchus idem, ac Porphyrius; et ita doctissimus Persius, sequente versu, *vitiato murice*.” J. Casaubon *Comment. in Persium*.

“ VI. 30. Μὴ βαφῆς, ne mergaris et obruaris, Xyl. imo, ne tingaris, ne inficiaris: ne mores aulici genuinum animi candorem obfuscant, quod inquinamentum combibere Septimius dixit de Spectac. c. 14.

ώς ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μιήνῃ,
ut Homerus loquitur *Il.* δ. 141. 1. ut Maro *Aen.* xii.

*Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro
Si quis ebur,*

quod nos diceremus, ‘that you be not stained’: nam quod Graeci μιάνειν et βάπτειν, nos dicimus ‘to stain.’ Eum autem Homeri locum respxit Plut. de *Ei Delph.* ubi dixit, eadem usus, qua hic metaphorice Marcus, voce: Τὸ ἐν εἰλικρινὲς καὶ καθαρόν ἑτέρου γὰρ μίξει πρὸς ἔτερον ὁ μιασμός. ὡς που καὶ “Οὐρηρος ἐλέφαντά τινα φονιστόμενον βαφῇ μιαίνεσθαι φησι· καὶ τὰ μιγγύμενα τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ βαφεῖς φθείρεσθαι, καὶ φθορὰν τὴν μίξιν ὀνομάζουσι: unde emaculandus auctor idem in *Symp.* I. viii. c. 5. Πάντα τὰ μεμιγμένα τῶν ἀμίκτων ἐπισφαλέστερα πρὸς σῆψιν ἔστι· ποιεῖ γὰρ ή μίξις μάχην, η δὲ μάχη μεταβολὴν μεταβολὴ δὲ τις η σῆψις διὸ τάς τε μίξεις τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ ζωγράφοι φθορὰς ὀνομάζουσι, καὶ τὸ βάψιον διῆναι κέκληκεν ὁ ποιητής: μιήναι legendum. Sicut et Latinis itidem *tingere*, *inficere*, et colore aliquo *tincta* dicuntur *infecta*. Idem in *Rom. Problem.* c. 26. Μόνον τὸ λευκὸν, εἰλικρινὲς καὶ ἀμιγὲς καὶ ἀμιλαντόν ἔστι βαφῇ καὶ ἀμίρτων. Sed et Porphyri. de *Abstin.* I. iv. καὶ ὁ μολυσμὸς καὶ η μιάνσις δηλοῖ τὴν μίξιν τοῦ ἐπεργενοῦς πρὸς ἔτερον καὶ μάλισθ’ ὅταν δισέκυπτον γένηται: ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βαρμάτων, ἀδὲ διὰ μίξεων συνιστανται, εἶσους; ἄλλου ἀλλως συμπλεκομένου μιαίνειν φεστίν.

ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μῆνη·

καὶ ἔμπαλιν τὰς μῆνες φθιγάδες οἱ ζωγράφοι λέγουσιν· ἡ δὲ συνήθεια τὸ ἄμπικτον καὶ καθαρόν, ἀφθαρτὸν καὶ ἀκραιφνὲς καὶ ἀκήρατον. Εαδεμ
hac metaphora usus est Marcus L. v. 16. ubi dixit, βάπτεται γὰρ
ὑπὸ τῶν φαντασιῶν ἡ ψυχή. et L. iii. 4. Sed in partem meliorēm
accepta, ubi de viro bono, δικαιοσύνῃ βεβαμένου εἰς βάθος.¹ Vult
ergo καθαρὰν μὲν ν διάνοιαν, ut L. viii. 4.3. aut, ut mox . se ipse ex-
plicat, ἀπλοῦν καὶ ἀκέραιον Scuec. Ep. 59. Etaī tūscile est: non
enī inquit nisi sumus, sed infecti, i. e. οὐ μειασμένοι, ἀλλὰ βεβα-
μένοι.” T. Gatakeri Comment. in M. Antonii. vi. 30. p. 238.
ed. 1697. 4to.

“ Dionys. Halic. περὶ ἀνομ. συνθεσ. xi. τῶν δὲ ἀμυντέρχες τὰς τάσεις
ἔχουσῶν αἱ μὲν κατὰ μίαν συλλαβθήν συνεφθαρμόν ἔχουσι τῷ δὲ τῷ βρυὸν,
recte interpres commisum: infra p. 78. R: συνεφθαρμένων ἀλλήλοις
καὶ ιδίᾳ φωνῇ λαμβανόντων: interpres, literis se int̄cere multa
coitione corrumpentibus: nisi male, certe ποιτικώτερον quam pro
ratione prosae Romanorum. p. 171. γεγραῖς συνεφθαρμένα τὰ φυτεῖα

¹ The proverbial phrase δικαιοσύνῃ βεβαμένου εἰς βάθος deserves to be noticed. “Οψις φαύτερα vi. 6. color purpure, qui videtur esse saturatus. vide Hist. Anim. viii. 18. et xv. 28.: cf. ad hoc Virgil.

Pylali suturo fucata colore

Servium et Jun. Phylargyrum: Cassiodorus L. I. Var. hunc purpure colorēta
eleganter vocat *obscenūlateū rubenteū, nigredinē sanguineam*. Philes. LII.
de Animal. Propriet. οἵρες εἰς βάθος, quod Bersmannas, verit, summe
giltus, et LIX.

ἡ δέ γε χρόα

δοκεῖ φέρειν ἔξαλμα (l. ἔξαμμα) πορφύρας βαθύ:

interpres, At color conchyliatus in profundo cernitus : Olympiodorus in L. III.
Meteor. Aristot. τὸ ἀλουργὸν ἐπὶ τῷ μελαντερῷ προστρέπει καὶ πορφυρίζειν
οἷς ἔστι τὸ ἐν τῇ ἀλουργίᾳ χρῶμα, et alibi eundem colorem ait, βαθύτερον
τῶν ἀλλών χρωμάτων, πρεσβύτερον αὐλοῦ colorib[us]: vid. et Salmasii Notas in
Tertull. de Pudicitia p. m. 134. et Plinius xxi. 8.” Kuhnus in Indice Eliani
V. H. These passages unfold the origin of the phrase.

Eustath. p. 456, l. 5. ed. Rom. Μιαίνει δὲ παρὰ τῷ ποιητῇ τὸ βάπτειν,
ὅπερ ἀλλοὶ φασσι στοιχίῳ φασιν ἐγτεῦθεν καὶ Μιαίφονος “Ἄργης οὐκ ἐπὶ²
ψογῷ, ἀλλ’ ἡς Λιμοβαθρῆς, καὶ Μιαρὸς αἴματι, οὐχ ἡς Μιαρατῆς
ημέραι παρὰ τοῖς ὑπερτεροῖς αἱ τῶν κατοιχυμένωις ἀλλ’ ὁ Λιμοβαθρῆς, κατὰ
τοῦ οὐδέποθι μιαρός: ὅπερ ἐν τῷ τέλει τῆς Ἰλιάδος κεῖται. Pag. 519, l. 1.
Σημειώσα δὲ καὶ έτι τὸ Μιαίφονος, οὐ δὲ ἐνταῦθα (Διξεις, “Δεξεις, βροτο-
λοιγή, μικρόνε) ἐπὶ θρησ κείται τι γάρ ἔδει μάτην οὕτω καὶ οὖν ἐν καιρῷ,
λοιδοροῦ εἶναι τὴν Ἀθηνᾶν; δηλοῖ δὲ ἀπλῶς οὕτως ἡς ἐν μετρίᾳ σκημματεῖ
τὸν Λιμοβαθρῆς, ἔστι γάρ Μιαίνεσθαι μὲν, τὸ βάπτεσθαι ἡς καὶ προ-
γεγεγαπταις ἀφ οὗ καὶ Μιαρός που νεκρὸς ἐν τοῖς ἔγγις, ὁ αἴμοβαθρῆς φύος
δὲ τὸ αἷμα ἐνθυμητόν δὲ καὶ ἡς ἐν τῇ προσεχώς ἐκτεθεῖσῃ χρήσει τοῦ
Αριστοφόνου, τὸν παρὸν Ομήλου Μιαίφονον, Μιηφόνον ἐκεῖνος ἔργη.
Heliodorus Athiop. x. 15. p. 479. (quoted by Prof. Porson on the Orestes
v. 909.) “dixit, nigrum in candido Chariclea brachio circulum memorans,”
καὶ γὰρ τις οὐκέτι ἔβειος περιθόμος ἐλέφαντα τὸν βραχίονα μιαίνει.

τοῖς σκισθοῖς ἔχουσσαις. vid Hemsteh. ad Lucian. T. I. p. 31.: tetigit nuper Matthai ad Numinium p. 133" Schaefer ad Dionys. Hal. De Compos. Herb. p. 129. Mr. Schaefer then cites from the *Critical Rev. July 1803*, p. 343 an extract from a letter written by Mr. Upton to Dr. Taylor in consequence of his note in *Lycurg.* p. 328 ed. 8vo. "φθορὰ apud pictores est colorum commixtio— unius adeo rei cum altera commixtio est φθορὰ, et ex tali communione naturalis et propriis colori perdunt et corrupti (Vng. Georg. II. 466. *Nec cayra luyquidi corruptitur usus oleari*), unde φθείσεσθαι est commixtione corruptere. Plat. in *Sympos.* p. 708. ἀνθρώπων μη ουοφύλων μηδὲ ομοιοπαθῶν εἰ τὸ αὐτὸ συμφέρει τινῶν, ι εἰ in unum confusorum, *commixtorum.*" This explanation corresponds with the remarks of Heinsterhus, who e note is quoted entire in the *Class. Recd.* p. 486, 7—"Pictoribus, inquinantibus, ac tructoribus propria φθείσει, φθορᾷ, et συμφθείσεσθαι de colorum inquinantorumque diversi generis mixtura: hac quidem temperatione sua cuncte perit pulchritudo, et corruptitur, sed arte tamen aliis extitit color, qui naturalem sæpe vincat."

We are not informed who first applied the term φθορὰ to denote "the mixture of colors" possible it is that Apollodorus the painter was the person. Plut. *de Glor. Athen.* p. 346. Α' Ἀπολλόδωρος ὁ ζωγράφος, ἀνθρώπων πρωτος ἐξεργάνων φθορὰν, καὶ ἀπόχρωσιν σκιάς, Ἀθηναῖος, ἦ. But Plutarch, as quoted above, has well explained how the term came to have that signification, and Heinsterhus has done so even more clearly. I may perhaps be permitted to suggest, that the painters might have taken the term from the philosophers, who understood by φθορὰ, as applied to death, ή κίνησις, εἰ τοῦ ὄντος εἰ το μὴ θεῖαι, ή ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄντος ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ δν' μεταβολὴ (see Zonaras, and Phavorinus quoted above), and that from its frequent use as a philosophical term to denote "the change of being, or removal from this world to another," together with the circumstance that it is frequently joined with words signifying "change," came its sense of mere "change," or "alteration," which I shall proceed to show that it sometimes has, after having quoted the words of Plutarch, which will serve somewhat to illustrate my notion, and vindicate it from the charge of gross absurdity πάντα τὰ μεμιγμένα τῶν ἀμίκτων ἐπισφαλίστερα πρὸς σηψίν ἔστι· ποιεῖ γάρ η μίξις μάχην η δ' μάχη μεταβολὴν μεταβολὴ δέ τις η σηψίς διὸ τά, τε μίξεις τῶν χρωμάτων οἱ ζωγράφοι "φθορᾶς" ὀνουάζουσι, καὶ τὸ βάθμοι διηγεῖ (μῆνας) κέκληκεν ο ποιητής Those, who reject the notion, which I have suggested to account for the signification of "change," will perhaps not withhold their assent from the idea that, as the word was used for "corruption," "detioration by mixture," "adulteration," it at length acquired the meaning of "change," where no "corruption, detioration, or adulteration," was included. Or we may thus explain it—that which is changed, is corrupted, and by a very natural pro-

cess of reasoning; the word, which signifies "corruption," is employed to denote "change," because the idea of "change" is involved in the idea of "corruption"—μεταβολή τις ή σῆψις, says Plutarch. We have in the *Agamemnon* v. 941.

γνώμην μὲν ἵσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ.

Stanley had at first translated the passage, "Animum quidem scito me neutiquam corrupturum," which he afterwards improperly corrected thus: "Minime dissimulaturum me scito sententiam meam." Abresch's note upon the passage runs thus: "Lys. Or. in Andoc. p. 104. πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφεισε. Isocr. ad Demon. p. 17. διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας. Eurip. Orest. 297. τὸ διαφθασέν φρενῶν. Aeschylus Choeph. 209. φρενῶν καταφθορά." Not one of the instances cited by Abresch is to the purpose. The words διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας in Isocrates mean, "when he was deprived of his reason in consequence of intoxication;" for a little before these words, we have ὅταν γὰρ ὁ νοῦς ὑπὸ οἴνου διαφθαρῇ. In the Choeph. 209.

πάρεστι δὲ ὀδίς καὶ φρενῶν καταφθορά,

the words φρενῶν καταφθορά denote "confusion, perturbation of mind." In Lys. Or. in Andoc. p. 222, 3. ed. Reiske, πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφεισε, the word διέφεισε means, as Reiske translates it, *mentem vitiarit et occacavit*. Eurip. Orest. 297.

ὅταν δὲ τόπῳ ἀθυμήσαντ' ἥης,

οὐ μοι τὸ δεινὸν καὶ διαφθαρὲν φρενῶν

ἰσχνανε παραμυθοῦ θ̄:

here τὸ διαφθαρὲν φρενῶν manifestly means "distraction of mind, or madness." Schol. ὅταν δὲ ἥης τάμα, ητοι ἐμὲ λειποθυμήσαντα, τούτ-έστιν μανέντα, σὺ τὸ δεινὸν ἐμοῦ, καὶ τὸ διαφθαρὲν τῶν φρενῶν, ητοι τὴν διαφθορὰν, ἔπειχε, καὶ κάλυπτε, παραμυθοῦ τε. Mr. Blomfield will be convinced of this in one moment. Dionys. Halic. *De Compos. Verb.* xviii. p. 246. ed. Schaefer. πότερον τοσαύτη περὶ αὐτὸν ἡ ἀναισθησία καὶ παχύτης, ὥστε μὴ συνορᾶν, οἵτινες εἰσιν εὐγενεῖς ή ἀγενεῖς ῥύματι, η. τοσαύτη θεοβλαβεῖα καὶ διαφθυρὰ τῶν φρενῶν, ὥστε εἰδότα τοὺς χρείττους, ἐπιτα σιρεσθαι τὸς χείρονας, where Schaefer cites this very passage without any remark. But in the verse of the *Agamemnon*, now under consideration,

941. γνώμην μὲν ἵσθι μὴ διαφθεροῦντ' ἐμέ,

the words γνώμην διαφθεροῦντα do not mean what, in the four passages quoted by Abresch, is meant by διαφθαρείσης τῆς διανοίας, "temporary loss of reason," "distraction of mind," or by τὸ διαφθαρὲν φρενῶν, φρενῶν καταφθορά, "madness," or any θεοβλάβεια, as in the words of Lysias, πῶς οὐ θεῶν τις τούτου γνώμην διέφεισε: but they mean to express simply that "he will not change his mind, or determination," and so Schutz rightly understood the passage. "Atqui, quamquam hæc, quæ de moderato fortunæ usu dixisti, verissima sunt, non tamen ea adversus sententiam meam dicere, ut per stragula picta incedere recuses, cui respondens Agamemnon negat

de commissurum ut propter uxoris studium SENTENTIAM MUTET." Schutz's good sense told him that this was the meaning, and he left it to others to reconcile this meaning with διαφθεροῦντα. As I had in the *Class. Recr.* p. 487. pointed out this to be the meaning of Agamemnon, I was somewhat surprised to find Mr. B., in his edition of the *Persæ*, ranking this passage among those instances, where διαφθείρει has the sense of *corrumpere*. But perhaps, when he comes to the *Agamemnon*, he will favor us with some elucidation of his obscure word *corrumpere*. In the *Class. Recr.* p. 255. I have observed that μορφῆς διαφθορᾶ in the *Prom. Desm.* 644. means "a total change of form":—

καὶ τοι καὶ λέγουσ' ὅδύσομει
Θερσυτον χειρῶνα, καὶ διαφθορὰν
μορφῆς, ὃντα μοι σχετλίᾳ προσέπεπτατο.

Stanley properly translates the words by "permutatio. formæ," and even Mr. B. himself, who understands the words literally, for he translates them by "formæ iuina," is obliged to subjoin by the way of explanation "mutatio in vaccam."

Mr. B.'s second instance of διαφθείρει in the sense of *corrumpere* is taken from Euripides *Hecub.* 601.

οὐδὲν διέφθειρ', ἀλλὰ χρηστός ἐστ' αἰεὶ.
φύσιν διέφθειρε, "is not corrupted in his nature," "does not lose any of his goodness."

I had quoted this passage in the *Class. Recr.* p. 487, and observed that διέφθειρ evidently signifies that the good man is not changed in his nature by calamity. But I now admit that we may very well understand by the words φύσιν διέφθειρε, "is not corrupted in his nature," "does not lose any of his goodness."

The third instance, which Mr. B. cites of διαφθείρει in the sense of *corrumpere*, is from that notable passage in the *Hippolytus*, of which neither he nor Professor Monk can easily make sense without the aid of some such alterations, as I have made in the *Class. Recr.* p. 252-5. 484, 5.

v. 390. ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπειδὴ τυγχάνω προγνοῦσ' ἔγω,
οὐκ ἔσθ' ὅποιώ φαρμάκω διαφθερεῖν
ἔμελλον, ἀστε τοῦμπαλιν πετεῖν φρενῶν.
λέξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὅδύν.

"*Διαφθείρειν* significat 'abolere, hic vero usu metaphorico *oblivisci*.'" Prof. Monk. If διαφθείρει here means *oblivisci*, the remainder of the sentence ὥστε τοῦμπαλιν πετεῖν φρενῶν has no meaning whatever, and must be expunged; for the sense of the words, with such an interpretation of διαφθερεῖν, is this.—"Since, then, I happen to be sensible of these things, (this human infirmity), there is no medicine, by which I could be brought to forget this passion, so as to fall into the opposite state of mind." But surely the state of mind opposite to *love* is *hated*, and not *forgetfulness*; and surely any person,

not blinded by prejudice, would allow that it is absolutely impossible to suppose that Euripides, or any person in his senses, could write any thing so inconsequential in its reasoning as this.—“ Since I am aware of these things, there is no medicine to make me forget my passion.” Mr. B., as we have seen, would translate διαφθείρειν in this passage by *corrumpere*, and so far as this goes, he escapes the absurdity into which his friend, Prof. Monk, has fallen, by understanding the word to mean “ *oblivisci*.” But till Mr. B. has presented us with a more correct view of the whole passage, I shall continue to read, point, and translate it thus—

ταῦτ' οὖν ἐπεῖδη τυγχάνω φρονοῦσ' ἔγω,
κοινὸν ἔσθ' ὅποια φαρμάκῳ διαφθερεῖν
ἔμελον, ἀστ' εἰς τοῦμπαλιν πεσεῖν φρενῶν,
λέξω δὲ καὶ σοὶ τῆς ἐμῆς γνώμης ὁδόν.

“ As then I am well aware of this (human infirmity), and as there is no drug (to be found), by which I was likely so effectually to change (my complaint), as to fall into the opposite state of mind, (that is, no drug capable of turning love into hatred), I will tell even to you what plan I mean to adopt.”

The last instance, to which Mr. B. has referred for διαφθείρειν in the sense of *corrumpere*, is in the *Bacchæ* v. 318.

καὶ γὰρ ἐν Βακχεύματι
φῦσ' οὐ γε σώφρων, οὐ διαφθαρήσεται,
“ qua natura pudica est, non corrumpetur.” Here I admit that διαφθαρήσεται means “ corruption of morals.”

I have somewhere remarked that “ the previous word φάρμακον, which signifies both *a medicine*, (or, *a remedy*), and *a color*, naturally suggested, upon the principle of the association of ideas, the metaphorical use of the word διαφθείρειν in the passage of the *Hippolytus*,” and I have to add, that the same thing has happened in another Play of Euripides—

ὅσας σφαγὴς δὴ φαρμάκων θανατίμων

γυναικες εὗρον ἀνδράσιν διαφθοράς; Eurip. *Ion.* 614.

We have in Diod. Sic. Vol. I. p. 238. ed. Wess: Folio, τὸν πατέρα φαρμάκῳ διαφθεῖσα.

I find that καταφθείρειν, συγκαταφθείρειν, and καταφθορά; which I have noticed as words of rare occurrence, are used by Polybius:—“ *Καταφθείγειν*, τὴν χώραν (i. q. δρόν) *vastare*, II. 64, 3. et 7. coll. vs. 6. τὸ πλεῖστου μέρος τῆς δυνάμεως, *amittere* (sicut διαφθείρειν) III. 60, 5.—Συγκαταφθείρειν τοὺς στρατιώτας, *simul perdere, amittere*,

¹ The conjecture of ἀστ' εἰς τοῦμπαλιν, for ἀστε τοῦμπαλιν, found its way as something original into the notice of Mr. Monk's *Hippolytus*, inserted in the *Quarterly Rev.*, though it had been published in the *Class. Recr.* many months before the said notice appeared.

ix. 26, 6.—Καταφθορὰ, ἡ, τῶν ἀνδρῶν, *interitus, cædes*, i. 49, 4. ii. 21. 6. iii. 35. 3. τῆς Ἑλλάδος, *perniciies*, xi. 6, 2. τῆς χώρας *devastatio*, iv. 67, 1. τῶν ἔργων, *destructio machinarum, igne crematarum*, i. 48, 8. ii. 21, 9." *Lex. Polybian.* Diodorus Siculus twice uses the word καταφθείσιν. Vol. i. p. 66. ed. Wess. Folio, τὴν συνεγγὺς χώραν; καταφθείσιν: p. 92. τὰ δὲ ἄλλα κατεψάζειν διὰ τὸν χρόνον.

Χρέειν, χραίνειν, χρίμπτειν, χρίειν, ζαχρηῆς, χεινίειν, ἀποχρέαίνειν, ἐπιχραίνειν, χρίζειν, ἀποχρώζειν, ἐπιχρώζειν, μολύνειν, radere: EURIPIDES illustrated.

Here it may be worth while to notice, as we are speaking on the subject of *the terms used by painters*, that Mr. B., when writing on the 61st verse of the *Sev. a. Thebes*, has fallen into a slight mistake—

v. 61. *χραίνει σταλαγμοῖς ιππικῶν ἐκ πνευμόνων.*

"*χραίνω, inquino: sensu primario leviter attingo:* cf. Ruhmken. ad Timæum p. 276. Porson. ad Eurip. *Orest.* 909." Mr. B. But the "primary sense" of *χραίνειν* is not "leviter attingere," but the word is applied to "touching the skin of the body," and thence comes its meaning "to touch the superficies of any thing lightly," and thence "to come near any thing." Porson in the passage, to which Mr. B. refers, is much more correct in his language: "*χραίνειν nihil aliud proprie significat, quam rei cuiusquam superficiem leviter radere, vel attingere.*" As we shall soon see, Porson was indebted to Eustathius for this interpretation of the word. Mr. B. refers us to Ruhmken's *Timæus*, as Porson had done before him, and there we are told that *χραίνειν* is properly *a technical term used by painters*: *Τιμæus, χραίνειν, ἥγουν ἀποχραίνειν, παρὰ τοῖς ξωγράφοις δὲ λέγεται τὸ μὲν χραίνειν, τὸ χρωζεῖν διὰ τοῦ φαβδίου τὸ δὲ ἀποχραίνειν, τὸ τὰς χρωσθέντα ἐνοποιεῖν*, and J. Pollux vii. 129., enumerating *the technical terms used by painters*, says:—*χρᾶσαι, ἐπιχρῶσαι, ἀποχρῶσαι, ἀνθεσι φαιδεύναι, χράναι, ἐπιχράναι, ἀποχράναι.* See Hesychius in v. *ἀποχραίνειν*: I shall find another opportunity of discussing Hesychius's words. Let us now turn to Eustathius. "Οὐπερ δὲ ὁ χροῦς, οὕτω καὶ δὲ χρῶς, τὸ προφαινόμενον δηλοῖ τῆς κατ' ἀνθρωπὸν σαρκὸς, ἥγουν τὴν χροιὰν κατὰ τὸ, παραδραΐσειν ἢ χροῆι διὸ καὶ πρὸς τὸ, ἐν χρῷ, ὅμοιοτητα ἔχει τὸ χρώζειν σίον, Γόνατα μὴ χρώζειν ἐμά· ἥγουν χρωτίζειν καὶ ἐν χρῷ ἔχειν. ὅμιον δὲ καὶ τὸ Μάγην κεχρωσμέθα· ἥγουν ἵκετεύθημεν κατὰ δεξιὰν καὶ γύνατα τοιωτού δὲ καὶ τὸ χραίνειν κατὰ παραγωγήν· οὐ πρῶτος μετέχει ὁ χροῦς· ἐξ οὐ τέτραπται πραγικῶς καὶ τὸ, ἀγυρᾶς χραίνων κύκλον συγγενεῖς δὲ τοῖς

τοιούτοις καὶ τὸ χρίμπτειν, ὃ ἐστινέν χρῶ πελάξειν καὶ τὸ χρίειν· ἔτι δὲ καὶ τὸ χράειν, ὃ ἐστιν ἐπιπίπτειν: p. 467. ed. Rom. Again, p. 1063. l. 23. ὡς Δαναοὶ Τρωεσσοιν ἐπέχραον, ἦργον ὡς καὶ προερρέθη ἐνεπέπεσον, καὶ, ὡς εἴπειν, ἐν χρῷ ἐπῆλθον, ζαχγηεῖσ οὖν ἐνταῦθα οἱ Δαναοὶ ὡς ἀλλαχοῦ οἱ λύκοι διὰ τὸ χράειν, ἐκ οὐδὲ οἱ ζαχγηήσ· καιρία δὲ ποιηταὶ η τοιαύτη λέξις, διὸ καὶ διε ἐνταῦθα κεῖται κατ' ἐπιμονὴν ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ τῆς παραβολῆς, καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀπόδοσει. Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι τε ἀπὸ τοῦ χράω, γίνεται πλεονασμῷ αἰσλικῷ τοῦ ὑ, χραφάω οἰον, Χράση μέν τ' αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενην. καὶ διὰ τὸ ἔχρας. καὶ τὸ παρ' Ἡροδότῳ ἐνέργειαν εἰς τὸ πρόσωπον. καὶ τὸ ἐπέχρας. καὶ τὸ χραύσαι. καὶ τὰ ἐκ τούτων, χρωτὸς καὶ χροὸς ποιὰν ἐπαρφῆν δηλοῦσσι· καὶ διὰ ἐκ τοῦ χράω χρῶ παγάγωγον τὸ χραίνω, καὶ τῷ ἕω ρένω χραίνειν δὲ, ἀεὶ ἐπὶ Φόργυ, κατὰ τὸ, Ἀστυ κάγορας χραίνων κύκλον. οὐ μήν καὶ τὸ μολύνειν τοιούτοιν εἰς δὲ τὸ χραίνειν μεταλαμβάνεται· αὐτῷ γάρ τὸ μὲν μολύνων τὴν ὑπῆνην, Φοργέρν ἐστι· τὸ δὲ, Ἰχθυδίων ἀποκνίσας τὰ κεανία ἐμδύν' ἀλεύσω, τεχνικόν ἐστιν, ὡς ἐπὶ τηγανίσματι γάρ δηλαδὴ ἐρρέθη. Phavorinus, who has this passage, for ιχθυώιων, gives ιχθιδίων, for ἀποκνίσας, for ἐπὶ τηγανίσματι gives ἐπιτηγανίσματα.

Before I close this article, it may be worth while to notice a strange opinion entertained by Facius about the celebrated passage in Eurip. *Orest.* 909.

διηγάνις ἀστυ κάγορας χραίνων κύκλον.

“χραίνειν ἀστυ, frequentare astu, ut χραίνεσθαι πόλιν, Soph. (Ed. C. 381.)” But the passage in Sōphocles by no means warrants this interpretation of the passage in Euripides:—

πελὺ μὲν γάρ αὐτοῖς ἦν ἔρως, Κρέοντί τε
θρίνους ἐασθαν, μηδὲ χραίνεσθαι πόλιν,
λόγω σκοπούσι τὴν πάλαι γένους φθορὰν,
οἷα κατέσχε τὸν σὸν ἄθλιον δόμον.

Σχολ. παλ. Πρὶν μὲν γάρ αὐτοῖς πρώτην ἥσχη σκοπήσαντες, τῷ Κρέοντι παρεχωρῆσαι τὴν σὴν βατιλείαν. Κρέοντί τε δὲ τε πλεονάζει. Λόγω σκοπούσι μετοχή ἐστιν, οὐ ρῆμα. The passage is, as I frankly own, to me very obscure. Biunck reads ἔρως, and thus writes:—“ Libri omnes ἦ ἔρις, quod series narrationis falsum esse ostendit, et a librario huc retractum fuit e. v. 372.: Th. Tyrwhitti conjecturam recepi, qua nihil certius mihi videtur: sic ἔρως occurrit infra 436, Eurip. *Phæn.* 631. *Alc.* 1101. *Suppl.* 139. *Iphig.* A. 813. et passim: vide notata ad prioris (Edipi v. 601.)” The anonymous writer of the *Observations on Sophocles*, appended to Bishop Burgess's Edition of Burton's *Pentalogia* p. 52. retains ἔρις, and thus explains the passage: “ Dele interpunctionem post ἔρις, quae quidem ap. Aldum nulla est: duarum sc. contentionum mentionem facit, quarum prior (utrum sc. solium relinquerent Edipi filii) erat inter ipsos et Creontem; posterior autem (de occupando) inter se ipsos.” In the *Lexicon Græcum*, subjoined to the *Pentalogia*, we have—“ χραίνωμαι, C. 360. polluo urbem, quasi imperio injusto

regens." "Annon præstiterit ἔρως, votum, cupido?" ut infra 449. Cieonti enī regnum permittentes, de quo contenderent, nihil erat."

In the passage of Euripides,

ὅλιγάκις ἀστού καγορᾶς χραινων κύκλου,

χραινων clearly means "approaching," "coming near." Thus in the Scholia we have:—Τὸ δὲ Ὀλιγάκις ἀστού καγορᾶς χραινων κύκλου, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐκκλησίαις οὐ περιερχόμενος, οὐδὲ πλησιάζων. In addition to the passages cited from Eustathius, I add one, which occurs in p. 531. l. 10. on *Iliad.* ε'. 138.

Δὴ τότε μιν τῇ; τόστον ἐλευ μένος ὥστε λέοντα,

οὐ φα τε ποιμὴν ἄγρῳ ἐπ' εἰροπόκοτες ὀλεσσι,

χραινῃ μέν τ' αὐλῆς ὑπεράλμενον:—

χραινεῖς δὲ λέγεται, τὸ ἐπιπολῆς ἔσται εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν χροῦν τοῦ σώματος· καὶ γίνεται ἐπενθέσει, ἥγουν πλεονασμῷ τοῦ, ἀπὸ τοῦ χράω^ν ᾧ τὸ ἔχειν κήδειν καὶ μητέριμοι μνηστῆρες ἐπέχειν. ᾧ δὲ χράω χραινώ, οὕτω καὶ λάσσω. οἶον, Ἀσπαλέοντα λάσσω, καὶ κατὰ πλεονασμὸν λαύνω ἐξ οὐ καὶ τὸ ἀπλαύνω καὶ λευκανία ὁ λαύριος. οὗτω δὲ καὶ ἡώ αὖτα τὸ πνέω καὶ φωνῶ. καὶ ψάω ψάνω καὶ ἐλάω ἐλαύνω ἐξ οὐ τὸ ἐλαύνω. Etym. M. χρῶ τὸ ἔρω, ἐξ οὐ χραινώ χραινω, Ἰλιάδος ε', χραινῃ, ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀμύην ἐπ' ὅλιγον τὸ χρώτα, ἐπιξύσῃ, ἤτοι προσεγγίσῃ ἀπὸ τοῦ χρωτὸς, χρώ, οἷον προσψύσῃ. The metaphor in Euripides is derived not *a polluendo*, as Musgrave supposes, but *a radendo*, and this interpretation may be well defended by the exactly similar use of *raderet*, "to approach," in the Latin poets. "Sæpe a poetis *raderet* dicitur, qui prope locum aliquem transit, ita ut pñne contingat, qui præternavigat, prætervolat, corriat vicino, undar rasente: Virg. *Aen.* vii. 10. *Piœuma Circæa raduntui littora terræ: Valer. Flacc.* v. 108. *alta Carambis Raditur: Virg. Aen.* III. 799. *Altas cantes projectaque saxa Pachyni Radimus: Aen.* V. 169. *Ille inter navenque Gycæ, scupulosque sonantes Radit iter lœvum interior: Ovid. Am.* III. el. ult. v. 2. *Raditur hæc Elegis ultima meta meis: Propert. III. 2. 23. Alter remus aquas, alter tibi radat arenas: adde Lucanum viii. 246. Simile est illud Ovid. Met. x. 654. de perniciibus cursoribus: Posse putes illos sicco freta radere passu, Et segetis canæ stantes percurrere aristas: Virg. Aen. V. 216. de columba, *Aere lapsa quieto Radit iter liquidum, celeres neque commovet alas, fende e scorie l' aria.*" Forcellinus in *Lex.**

Halton, May 4, 1815.

E. H. BARKER.

BENTLEII EMENDATIONES INEDITÆ
IN ARISTOPHANEM.

[No. III.—Continued from No. XXII. p. 259.]

IN RANAS.

COLLATUM est hoc drama cum MS. Sto Barocciano [fortasse eodem libro] quem in partes suas vocavit Gaisfordus ad Hephaest. p. 303.]

4. χολή. Suidas in Πάννῳ [habet] σχολή: male; neque Kusterus corrixit. [At Dawes, p. 232, σχολὴ verum esse contendit.]

7. MS. Θαρρῶν γε μόνον δὲ ἔκεινος ὄπως: [Ita MS. Briuncii.]

11. ὅται: Suid. in Φέρμῃ habet ὅτε. Forte lege πλήν γε ὅτε μέλλω γὰρ ἔχεμεν. Sed in Μέλλω [unde illud εἴδε hausit Bentl.] ὅται μέλλω γε ἔχεμεν.

38. In Schol. “καὶ Μαλίας καλουμένης ἄχρας.” Innio Μαλέας —ἄχρας in Xenophont. Ellen. I. 446. Strabone est Μαλία, quod tertius.

34. Ἡπεῖν MS. Ἡγῆ: mox, Schol. ἡμί—pro φημί: dein, pro νὴ Δίᾳ habet μὲν Δ. [sic MS. apud Br.]

51. Ita MS. ΗΡ. σφῶ, ΔΙ. νὴ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ΗΡ. καὶ τ':

55. μικρός· MS. μηκεός: alia manu α scribitur super η. Suid. μικρός in Μόλων.

57. ξυν γένου Κλεισθένει; MS. inserit τῷ. [sic aliū]

64. lege οὐ τέργη [et sic Seidler de Veis. Dochmias p. 388.]

76. Σηφικλέα ultimam habet longani. Aut ergo lege Εἰτ' οὐ Σοφοκλέα πρότερον ὄντ' Εὔρηπίδου; aut οὐχὶ, deleto ὄντ'.

79. MS. εἴπερ γε [sic MS. Boig.] mox v. 86, MS. Ξενοκλεης.

99. lege τοιουτοι Suid. τοιουτον in Παρακεκινδυεμένον.

100. χρόνου τόσα Euripides Baech. 886

102. ἥπα: MS. ἀνεύ Suid. l. c. Τίτια η ἀνεύ.

103. Suid. in Σὲ δὲ κ.τ.λ. habet Σὲ δὲ τῷτ' ἀρέσκει μᾶλλον: Sed MSS. Kusteri μᾶλλά. Vid. v. 624, 7ο7. 763. Achai. 458. Av. 109. Sic οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ est affirmativum: vid. [Eq. 1202, et Gaisford ad Hephaest. p. 27, et Markland ad Suppl. 569.]

Ibid. MS. τοι. mox. 104. MS. κόβαλα [Sic MSS. apud Br.]

108. lege ἐνεκα [Sed οὖνεκα est magis usitatum, tam Comiciis quam Tragicis.]: mox MS. ἐχων [pro φέγω]. MSS. Br. ἐνεκα—ἐχων.

121. γὰρ omittit Suid. in Θράνιον, Κάλως et Πυλήενς.

131. MS. πῃ: et mox 136 ἀλλ' ἵνπερ [ubi vulgo deest ἀλλ'.]

137. ἑξις μεγάλην Suid. in Αιβυστρος.

138. dele γε [et sic MS. apud. Br.]—146. νῶν MS. σχολ. φέον.

174. πόσος: MS. ποῖ: et mox 176. MS. ήν ἀν [vice ἐαν.]

185. MS. *ΔΙ.* Νὴ τὸν Ποσειδῶ.

186. delecto *ΔΙ.* Bentleius sequitur Schol. [sic Hotibius.]

186. σαπροί: leg. σάτυροι. [Haec emendatio est feliciter exco-
gitata: etenim Achæus plurimas fabulas Satyricas composuit.]

193. Forte lege τὴν περὶ τῶν ἄλγων. Intelligit Carias Argi-
nus as. vel περὶ τὴν ἀκραν: ut Malia intelligatur. Vid. v. 33. Pho-
tius in *Κρέας*: “Τὴν περὶ τῶν κρέων.” Οὐδὲ Ἰείων γράφει τὴν περὶ¹
τῶν νεκρῶν τῶν ἐν Ἀργινούσαις ἀτάφων, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἀνηρεύησαν οἱ στρα-
τηγοί. Sane τὸ νεκρῶν optimè personæ Charontis aptatur.

Ibid. In Schol. sic legitur Sophoclis fragmentum Τοιοῦτος ων
ἀρξεις σὺ τοῦτε τοῦ κρέως: vulgo deest σύ: [quod supplevit Br. in
Κρίσει.] *

195. τρέχων: MS. κύκλω [sic MSS. alii.]

197. *ΔΙ.* μανθάνεις. Ita MS.—209. MS. κάτα κάλεται.

211. MS. semper *Βρεκκεκέξ*: et Suidas in *Βρεκκεκέξ* et *Αἰόλων*.
[Ipse Bentleius semper *Βρεκκεκέξ*.]

220. MS. τῆς ιερῆς χύτεως.

222. Totum hunc versum omittit MS. et 269.

235. ὑπολύτιον: lege ὑπολύτιον vel ὑποβρύχιον.

240. MS. ἀγνήθας.

242. forte παύσασθε νῦν: ut versus hi duo sint pares [scil.

· · · Άλλ’ ω φιλαρδὸν γένος παύσασθε νῦν.

· · · Μᾶλλον μὲν οὖν φθεγξόμεσθ’, εἰ δῆποτ’ εὐ——]

245. MS. ἡλώμεθα.—Suid. in φλέω. 247. lege πολύκολαύμβοισι.

252, 3. Utroque Baccho tribuit Bentl. Similiter 263, 4.

288. MS. Ηοῦ ποῦ στιν. ΞΑ. ἐξόπισθεν. MS. Vat. ποῦ ποῦ

· · · ξόπισθεν.

292. Omissum γε in Frob. supplet Bentl. e Suid. in *Εμπουσα*.
et MS. ubi bis ποτε [sic MS. Rav. et alii.]

295. γ' omittit Suid. in *Εμπουσα* [sic MSS. apud Br.]

297. MS. *ΔΙ.* καὶ δικέλος et ΞΑ. Νὴ τὸν [sic MS. Rav.]

302. δέ γ' ἥττον: MS. δέ εἴ' ἥττον: lege γ' εἴ' ἥττον [sic MSS.
apud Br.]

304. lege πάντ' ἄγαθα. [sic MSS.]

305. In Schol. ita legit Bentl. Fragmentum Strattidis *A.*, ποῖ
πρὸς θεῶν ποῖ ποῖ γαλῆν. *B.* γάλην. *A.* ἔγω δ' ἀμην σὲ λέγειν γαλῆν
όρω: et ad illud Samyrionis adscripsit varias lectiones τι—ἐνδύ-
σομα—οὗτος εἰς ἔχθρούς μέγα quas præbet Schol. ad Orest. 279.
ubi corrigit Bentl. Θρέστην—et *Kινάρογ*: hic vero reposuit εἰσιδῶν
μέγα.

307. Olim voluit Bentl. κατόμοσόν μοι. Νὴ Δία: collatis Nub.
1234. ἀπομόσαι μοι τὸν Θεούς: et Av. 444. κατόμοσον—μοι postea
inseruit e MS. τὸν omissum in Frob. ante *ΔΙα*. [sed melior videtur
conjectura quam MS. lectio. vid. vers. seq.]

311. MS. μοι [sic duo alii teste Beck] mox idem τὰ κακὰ²
ταυτὶ [duo apud Br.]

314. αὐλεῖ τις ἔνδον. Hæc, vulgo in textu posita, delet Bentl.

- Collato Schol. ad v. 1282. Achar. 115. [ubi exstat ἡ πηγεπιγραφή,
ἐπινέσι.] Av. 223. [ubi Λέλαι τις in textu sedem habet.]
318. MS. Baccho tribuit.
326. et sqq. Σερ. 343 et sqq. Αντιστρ. [Vid. Hermann. de
Metris, p. 352.]
327. MS. ἐν ἔδραις [sic Rav.] mox σῇ [pro σῷ.]
328. MS. "Ιαχχ." ω̄ ιαχχεω̄ ω̄ ιαχχε.
336. τιμάν: lege τ' ἐμάν: mox dele comma-posti φλογί.
347. MS. ἀποσελούται [ut alii]: mox omittit τ'.
353. MS. λαμπάσι. [ut unus MS. apud Br.]
354. MS. et Schol. ἔξαρ' ἐπ' ἀνθηρόν.
358. γνώμη Suid. in Εὐστρατ. mox καθαρεύει Scal. Gellius
[in Praefatione, p. 11.] Plutarch. [11. p. 348. D.]
359. εἰδεῖ: Recete Ald. ιδεῖ: Gellius et Suid. in Τανγράχου, εἰδεῖ:
Plutarch. ησεν.
372. lege τοῖσιν: MS. Gellius et Suid. in Απαυδῶ dant τούτοις.
ibid. post καθῆς inseritur τὸ τελτον a Suid. et Gell. MS. τελτον.
375. et sqq. Hos in sex versus dispescuit Bentl. nec tamen
Antistrophicorum nomine insignivit, licet sex ejusdem mensuræ in
ordinem redegerit quorum initium posuit in v. 380. 'ΑΛΛ' ἐμβα.
[Hotibus vero eos Antistrophicos appellat.]
- ibid. δὴ νῦν: dele δὴ et leg. νῦν eucliticum: vid. 443. χωρεῖτε νῦν.
383. εἰς τὰς ἀράς: dele τὰς [recte]: in hac formula non usurpa-
tur articulus: cf. Lys. 392. et 1036.]
- 387 et sqq. necnon 392 et sqq. disposuit Bentl. ut exstant in
edd. Kust. et Br.
391. παισαι: lege παιζαι [sic voluit Kust.]
397. Ἀγ' εἰα: forte Αλλ' εἰα.
- 401 et sqq. Numeris Arabicis notavit versus quatuor; quos
liceat systema ά [Anglice stanza] vocare.
- 406 et sqq. systema β'. 4. vers.
407. lege τὸν τε σανδαλίσκον.
- ibid. Suidas Εὔτελεια, σμικρορρέπεια. Εὔτελεια δὲ εὐθαισσιν
παρὰ τὸ εὖ τελεῖν. Αριστοφάνης. Σοὶ γάρ διδάσκειν Ἐπ' εὐτελείᾳ τὸν
σανδαλίσκον. Videtur alias esse locus. [Non reperitur inter Aris-
tophanus fragmenta a Brunckio congesta.]
- 412 et sqq. systema γ'. 4 vers.
- 419 et sqq. Disposuit ut exstant in Kust. et Br. quatuor sys-
tematis 3 vers. notatis.
421. In Schol. "Post ὁδοντας Suidas in Φράστηρας inserit. Φράσ-
τηρας: quod Palmerius ut suum dedit."
425. lege κάστιν: mox MS. Κλεισθένη.
430. lege ω̄ ναφλύστιος [et sic Porson ad Orest. 1645.]
433. κυσθου MS. et Suid. in Ιππόπορε.
440. MS. αἴρει: vid. 505 et 607. [Sic alii MSS.]
- 443 et sqq. et 447 et sqq. duo systemata 4 vers.
- ibid. lege χωρεῖτε: mox dele θεᾶς.

447. *AI.* omittit MS. mox lege ταῖσιν—παννυχίζουστι [sic Hostibius.]
451. MS. πολυρρόθους cum σχελ. πολυήχους.
- ibid. et sqq. necnon 457 et sqq. notantur quasi systemata, quae in Ald. et Kust. sunt Antistrophica.
458. καὶ delet MS. et legit ἵεγόν: vid. Schol. ad 443.
461. τὸν omisso supplet MS. [sic alii.]
468. MS. καὶ τολμηρὲ κάναισχυτε σύ: vid. Pac. 181. et 361.
470. MS. ἡμῖν.
476. dele ἥ vel lege ἔκατον γέφαλος; vid. Nub. 335. [sic MSS.]
477. πνευμόνων MS. et Suid.
476. In Scho. βεύσονται: “σδ. ύσσονται.”
486. MS. πρόσθου Ε.4. ποῦτιν [ut alii.]
491. Οὐκέντι: Scal. οὐκ ἀν [sic MSS].
497. lege ληματίας: Suid. in Ἰδι habet ληματίας.
501. Suidas in Οὐ γὰρ habet πιστέον. Vide etiam eum in Πειστέον et Πιστέον.
511. Κάλλιστα est excusantis, recusantis ut Latinis, *Recte*, *Benigne*; et sic paulo post χαλῶς. [Et sic Scholiastes: quem vide ad v. 915.] *Recte* quoque Scaliger personas distinguit.
515. Scal. ΘΕ. pro *AI.* et delet ΘΕ. in vers. seq.
519. Inter Schol. ad verba τῷ αὐτῷ ποιητῇ addit Bentl. “ἐν Αηματίαις Hesych. in Δοριάλλος. lege Αἱ δὲ γυναικες τὸν δοριάλλον φράγγυνται. Vid. Etymol. in Δοριάλλος.”
522. Malę Scal. φέάσων. Nam Θεράπαια loquitur non Θεράπων. ibid. δρχηστρίσι MS. et Suid. in Αὔτος.—534. “Οξ Scal. male.
544. Suid. in Μαλθακώτερον habet Μιταστρέφεσθ' ἀεί.
547. Εὑ: lege ἥ. MS. Vat. ἀν. [Vid. Porson. Hom. Οδ.]
550. lege κυνῶν [et sic Br.]
556. MS. μ' ἐξέκοψε [sic MS. C. apud Br.. qui sēpe cum Barocc. convenit.]
559. lege κατέφαγ': [et sic Hermanni. de Métr. p. 152.]
- ibid. MS. ἡμῖν. et vice Π.4. semper habet Ετερ. Πανδοκ.
566. Hic MS. addit 'Ετερ. Π. et ΠΑΝ. 567 et 569. cuius vice in locis proximiis legit Bentl. ΕΑ.
568. ὅντερ σύν: MS. ὁν ὄντος [et sic alii.]
570. εἰς μὲ Suid. in Εμυκάτῳ.
573. MS. initio versus præfigit ΕΑΝ.
575. lege ἐξέξας [et sic Kust. in notis.]
593. τύπτῃς MS. et Suid. in Οἰδος οἰδα.
601. σαντὸν ἀεὶ omittit MS.
607. Ald. ἀνάγκη τις: lege στὶν: [et sic Beck.]
624. In Schol. Non μάλα: sed μ' ἀλλά: vid. 103 et Thesm. 653 ubi [ubi corrigit Bentl. μ' ἀλλά vice μάλα.]
631. βασανίω Suid. in Βασανίων et Κλιμακίζειν.
635. Ald. et Suid. γητείω.—638. ἔτι δ' εἰς Suid. in Κλιμακί.
640. MS. τὸν ταχέων τὰ σκεύη.

657. MS. σχόπει νῦν ἦν μ' ἀποκινήσαντ': MS. Vat. ὑποκινήσαντ'
recte.
658. δοκεῖς: lege δοκεῖ vel δοκῶ [sic Reisk. et Schäfer, si recte
memini.]
- 662: δὴ omittit MS.—665. lege πάλι et sic in 671.
668. ἐπειτα: MS. ἐπὶ [et sic duo Harleiani teste Elmsleio ad
Acharn. 178. in Auctario.]
678. Scal. πρωνές.—687. MS. ἐμᾶς ἀοιδᾶς.
693. lege θηγκία [sic Br. perperam: κονίας est Bacchius.]
694. κελαρύζει Suid. in Ἐπίκλαντον.
696. ἀπόλοιτο Suid. in Ἡς ἀπόλοιτο.
701. In Schol. Τραγικῶν agnoscit Suid. in Παλαίσμασι: in Φρύ-
νιχος habet στρατηγῶν.
717. MS. ποτ': [et alii] et in 720 γ' οὗτος.
718. In Schol. lege ὡς πολιῆται.
724. dele τε: quod habet Suid. in Κλειγένης et Κυκηστέφρου.
726. MS. ἐκδιατρίψει: mox fo. ἴδων vice εἰδώς.
732. In Schol. ἄλλὰ νικᾶ. fo. Ἑλλάνικος [sic Tyrwhittus in
Not. MSS.]
741. Stobaeus, p. 241=169. παλαίστρᾳ et in 747. ἀξίου γάρ:
Grot. γοῦν.
742. προσελοῦμεν MS. Ald. Suid. et Stob. at MS. unus Stobæi
προσυγελοῦμεν: quæ vera est lectio. Hesych. Προσυγελεῖν. At Gro-
tius προσελάμμεν: male.
748. MS. σφαλεῖτ': Suid. in Ἀξιον habet χάν τε σφαλεῖτ': at in
Ἀπὸ χαλοῦ ξύλου et in Κάν τι habet χάν τι.
750. MS. Αἴαν: sed ex alia manu Δοῦλος Αἴαν: et si indein-
ceps.
757. leg. μ' ἄλλα vid. 103. et sic in 763.—759. MS. τονθορύζειν.
763. MS. Vat. ἀττ' ἄν.—765. Citat Photius Μιαίνειθαι.
771. MS. et Ald. πρᾶγμα πρᾶγμα: mox γάρ omittit MS.
775. MS. ξυντυχάν: et mox κατῆλθ' [sic alii.]
809. Etymologus in Τάλαντον habet Ἄλλ' ἡ—κριθήσται.
810. MS. τι δαί.
812. Suid. in Ηλαίσια habet ξύμπτητα. MS. ξύμπτυκτα.
816. Ἐβλεψε γοῦν MS. et Suid. in Ταυρηδόν.
819. lege Ἀθηναῖοις: sed Suid. in Συνέβαινεν habet Οὐ γάρ
Αθηναῖοις.
826. et sqq. Quatuor systemata septem vers. Bentl. numeravit.
829. MS. ὅδοντ' Ald. ὅδοντα.. forte legendum θήγοντά τ' ὅδοντας.
835. lege σκινδαλήμαν [sic MSS. duo apud Br.]
853. MS. πνευμόνων et mox μεθείμην [sic MSS. duo.]
861. Suid. in Ἀγριωποίν: et sic in Ἐγῷδα: at in Ἀγριώπου ut
MS. e 2nd. manu: ubi σχολ. ἀγρων τὴν φωνήν: [quære an μορθὴν
præbeat MS.?]
862. Suid. Ἀπύλωτον: at ἀβύλωτον in Ἀγριώπου.
879. θείων Suid. in Κεφαλαιώ.

891. lege ὡγῶν νῦν [sic Dawesius.]
895. MS. ἐπαστεί legit ὑπάστατε Etymol. in 'Τπογραμμός'
899. MS. addit ὡ et Καὶ in 908. et in 905. omittit τε.
904. lege στρεβλοῖς.—910. MS. σοφίας ὁδὸς [sic alii.]
917. σοι: MS. εἰσὶ et Suid in Καλως.
920. lege Εὔνεσίς τε καὶ [et sic Bl.]
- 922 et sqq. Δτρ. 1023 et sqq. Λυτοτρό.
935. Citat Suid. Λύτοτρόμνοις et Λῆμα
943. Post Νιόβην adscriptis titulæ Bentl.
948. γάρ: lege ἄρ' [sic Elmsleius in Edinburgh Rev. N. 37. p. 87.] vel γ' ἄρ'.
961. dele ἦν [sic Elmsleius l. c. p. 85.]
967. MS. ποιά γ' [ut alii.]
969. In Schol. scripsit Βηλα. i. e. vela.
970. Ald. omittit μέν.—972. Suid. in "Ισχανα."
973. λευκοῖς MS. et Suid. in "Ισχανα."
974. In Schol. πτυσάνης. At Suid. πτισάνης in "Ισχανα."
- ibid. ——— γράφεται δὲ καὶ ἀπηθῶν. Sic Etymol. in Ηθμός.
976. ἐκπεσῶν Scal.—983. τούτι: MS. τοῦτο [et sic C. apud Br.]
989. MS. εἴθ' ὑποτοπεῖσθαι. Suid. in Καχυποτοπεῖσθαι.
997. forte καρβανοπιτυοκάμπται vel στορμφασμο—. Suidas agnoscit Σαρκασμοπιτυοκάμπται.
998. οἷμδ, Suid. in Κόμψος.—1010. τοῦτ' lege τόδι.
1012. Suid. Αἴκε πάθοι.—1014. ζητεῖται Suid. in Πούστι μ' ἥ.
1018. lege σκορδόνιον —1019. MS. ἐλαῖας. Suid. τὰς ἐλάσις βίσι.
1020. Suid. in Αβελτ—Βουταλιών et Μαρμαχ—habet ἀβελτερώτατοι: et MS —τεροι.
1021. μαμάκινοι Suid. in Μεταγένης.
1022. lege Σὺ εέ: mox forte legendum μόνον ὅπως μημονεύσῃς ut respondeat Στιοφαῖ.
1029. ἀντιλέξῃς Suid. in 'Ιστίοις et Λεῖον.'
1031. lege ιστίοις: et sic Suid. l. c.
1035. In 'Ιστίοις Suid. καθεστήκοι λάβοις.'
1051. MS. σὺ τι δράσας αὐτοὺς οὕτως ἀνδρείας ἔξεδίδαξας. [Vid. Bentl Epist. ad Mill. p. 19. ed. Cant. 470 ed. Lips.]
1053. lege Θήβαις ut hodie titulus est. sed Eustathius, p. 1218. *Bentl. Θήβαις.*
1058. τοὺς omittit MS. recte si legas ἔξεδίδαξα [sic Porson Praef Hec p. 55.]
1060. forte legendum ἡγίκ' ἀκούστας περὶ Δαρελου τοῦ τεθνεώτος 'Ο χορός γ' vel ἡγίκα γ' ἡκουστεν Σαρσίου—Darius enim magnam dramatis partem loquitur et Chorus tum iῷ δὲ lamentatur.
1060. Suid. Ιανοῖ σχετλικτικὸς ἐπίβρομα.
1067. τοῦθ': lege τοῦδε.—1068. Δι. sed MS. ΕΓ.
1076. MS. εἴθ': et delet ἀν. forte Οὐδὲ εὖ οἶδ' εἴθ' ἡντιν' ἐγδοσαν.
1077. MS. μηδέν σοι.
1078. MS. ἐπικαθητο. [Vid. Elmsl. ad Heracl. 283.]

1079. lege *ΔΙ.* ὥστε γε et mox dele *ΔΙ.*
 ibid. MS. κάπουνέβαλεν.
 ibid. Vid. Pac. 700. [ubi Bentl. vult ἐσέβαλον collato ibid. 745]
 1082. MS. γενναίας καὶ γενναίων [sic alii.]
 1083. lege πιέν [sic MSS.]—1084. lege τοῦτον [sic MSS.]
 1087. τοῖς δὲ ήβωσι ποιηταῖς: lege vel τοῖσι δὲ [et sic *Fiorillo* (rectius dictus *Furville*) ad Herod. Attic. p. 151.] vel τοῖς ήβωσι
 δὲ ποιηταῖς Πάνυ δὲ δῆ.
 1089. forte Παρνήθων.—1091. γε omittit MS.
 1095. lege ἑλινοί [sic probante Porsono Praef. Hec. p. 8.]
 1096. Sic distinguit Bentl. ἔβλαψά τι δράσας; [sic Reisk.]
 1101. ἀπαφανάνθην Suidas: sed in serie sua Ἐπαφανάνθην. lege
 ἀπαφανάνθην.
 1137. ἀναδάξεσθον: sed syllaba brevis esse debet. lege ἀναδάξι-
 σεσθον. [His conjecturis proximæ sunt Dawesianæ ἀναδάξασθον et
 ἀναδάξαρτε.]
 1150. leg. οὐ [sic MSS.]—1153. MS. ἀσαφές.
 1155. forte Ορθοτείχος [sic MSS.]—1161. MS. ταῦτα πάντα.
 1178. MS. μᾶλλον.
 1188. lege ἦκω [fortasse ex Gellio. XIII. 24.]
 1192. lege ταῦτόν ἐστιν ἀλλ' ἐτέρως. MS. et ed. vet. ταῦτ' ἐστ'
 ἀλλ' ἄγιστ' ἐπῶν.
 1194. Εἰς γῆν μὲν ἐλθεῖν Suid. in "Ηχω.—1204. lege λέγε.
 1209. Ἰδοις Suid. in Στοιβῇ.
 1211. μούστιν pro μοι ἐστιν. Suid. Οὐ γάρ μούστιν ἀλλ' ἀκουσ-
 τέα. τὸ τέλειον οὐ γάρ ἀλλά μοι ἐστιν ἀκουστέα ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνυ γάρ.
 Ἀριστοφάνης ἐν Βατράχοις· καὶ ἐν Ἰππευσιν (v. 1202). "Απιθ· οὐ
 γάρ ἀλλὰ τοῦ παρθεντος ἡ χάρις. Vid. Eq. 996, 1088. [addi
 poterat v. ιησ. 1446].
 1213. MS. εὐδαιμόνι.
 1215. πρὶν μὲν ἡ φῦναι Ἀπόλλων: MS. πρὶν φῦναι μέν: lege ω
 πόλλων.
 1229. κατ' ἔπος δὲ Suid. in Ἀπὸ ληχύνιον.
 1250. Ληχύνιον. N. B. et cæsura est et casus nominativus ante
 ἀπώλεσεν venit. Ληχυθ—est casus accusativus.
 1251. lege τί ἐστ'; mox dele γε post τοῦτο.
 1270. MS. ἔαστον [ut C. apud Br.]—1271. MS. πολύζωτρυν.
 1283 et sqq. Duo systemata trium versuum.
 1288. f. ἔγωγχ vice ἔγωγ?—1285. γ' omittit MS.
 1287. νῦν ὅντων: lege νοῦ: vid. 1120. ὡρ' ἀγυμνασίας ἔτι νοῦ
 [sic Gaisfordus ad Hephaest. p. 303.]
 1281. MS. μέμψεται [ut alii] mox lege τουτονί.
 1290. forte ἀνάκτορα Hesych. Ἀνάκτωρ.
 1294. Post προσαλεῖ additur τις in MS. et Suid. in Διαιύλιον.
 1296. MS. habet σχολ. ἰστέον ὅτι τὸ ἱκοτον οὐ πελάθεις ἐπ'
 ἀργωγῶν παιίων πανταχοῦ ἐπιφέρει χυρίως ἐκείνων τῶν Ἰαμβέσιων ὃν τοῦ
 φθιώτ· Ἀχιλεῦ.

1316. *AI. lege AI.*—1318. MS. οὐβας [ut alii.]
 1323. MS. χεροὶ καὶ δόρυ.—1329. MS. σωγχλινή τ'.
 ibid. In quibusdam exemplaribus h. v. deest. Vid. Schol..
 1335. Μ'. iεγέν [ut alii.]
 1337. Μελίτου: MS. Μιλήτου. lege Μελήτου. et sic Athenaeus xii. p. 551. [ubi Μέλιτος Schweigh. contra MS. A.] mox dele καὶ: et sic Suid. in Μέλιτος.
 1342. ταῦτ': MS. τάδ' ἔστ' [sic MS. Vat.]
 1349. MS. lacerus.—1364. τοι Scal.
 1366. Suid. Κλαύνεφαῖς.—1385. lege ὀρεστίγονος.
 1410,1. Ex his duobus efficitur senarius.
 1412. γὰρ ἀγαγεῖν: Insece αὐτὸν. vel τοῦπος ut in 1428 et 1435,
 vel κατ' ἕπος ut 1454. [MSS. 3. apud Br. αὐτόν.]
 1423. lege ἐπιθόμην [ut MSS.]
 1447. ΙΙ. lege ΙΙ. mox 1448. est ex ore ΙΙ.
 1450. Bentl. citat Schol. Phæn. 1201.
 1455. dele comma post γυνή: notat. τὴν κιναιδίαν Cephiso-
 phontis.
 1464. dele δῆ: mox lege οὐν. [sic MS. apud Br.]
 1475. μέγα: Suid. μέγαλα in Διψυοι.
 1485,6,7,8,9. Lineis uncinis circumdedit Bentl. [Vid. Schol.]
 1496. Suid. in Δαρφύτεροι habet χρηστίμενος αὐθείημεν ἄν. [sic Dawes. p. 213.]
 1500,1. Hīs pro spuriis rejicit Bentl. [Vid. Schol.]
 1514. γ' addit Suid. in Περικλῆς.—1525. Suid. Τίς δὲ οἰδεν.
 1526. In Schol. τοῦτο ἐξ Ἰππολύτου: lege Ηολυθέου. vid. Schol.
 ad Hippol. 191. καὶ αὐτὸς εν Ηολυθώ.
 1535. τοῦτο et τούτοις Suid. in Ηλούτων.—1553. lege τούτοισι.
 1555. post ἡκών addit ἔγώ Suid. in Δεῦρο [sic Toup. ad Suid.]
 1559. θώρ.ον: in θάκον [sic Br.] MS. Vat. θάκον.
 1561. lege καὶ μοι σάζειν [sic Tyrwhitt. in Not. MSS.]
 1574. lege τοῖσιν ἔαυτοῦ.—1575. lege μόλπεισι.

ON THE 77th
VERSE OF THE HIPPOLYTUS.

Σὺ τὸν πλακτὸν σύζων ἐξ ακηφάτου
 θειμῶνος, ὁ δέσποινα, ποσμήσους φέρω,
 ἐν' οὔτε παιμὴν ἀξιοὶ φέρβειν βοτὰ,
 οὔτ' ἥλθε πω σιδηρος, ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον
 μέλισσα λειμάν' ἡριγὸν διέρχεται,
 αἰδὼς οὐ τοτεμίασι κηπεύει δρόσοις. Hipp. v. 72—7.

Amid the discussions, which have found their way into your *Journal*, on this celebrated passage, I have seen no notice taken either by Mr. E. H. Barker, or by any other critic, of the opinion

of Jacob Bryant, whose version of the passage is not altogether unworthy of attention:—

“ An allegorical personage watering the meadow seems to us a very idle conceit. Were it a garden to be really watered by a supply taken from the river, *Aïdwës*, or *Modestiy*, for the modest votaries of the Goddess, might be more tolerable. But here all is the work of nature, and the morning [εως, ηως, αιως,] is very naturally supposed to draw up his dews from the river. We have another authority for this reading, which no critic has yet cited. Mr. Bryant, in a beautiful Ionic Temple in Blenheim gardens, supposed to be dedicated to Diana, with this inscription,

APTEMIAI AI'PAI IA'I OPEΣΤIAI,

has inscribed the six first verses of this speech of Hippolytus with the reading ηως, to which he has subjoined the following very elegant translation.—

To thee, bright Goddess, these fair flowers I bring,
 A chaplet woven from th' untainted mead,
 Thy cool sequester'd haunt; where never yet
 Shepherd approach'd, where the rude hind ne'er heav'd
 Th' unhallow'd axe; nor voice nor sound is heard,
 Save the low murmuring of the vernal bee:
 The day-spring from above the dew distills;
 Genuine and mild, *from the pure stream exhal'd*
 On every fragrant herb, and fav'rite flower.

The version of this eminent Scholar is thus a comment, as well as a translation.” *Review of Egerton's Edition of the Hippolytus in the Brit. Crit. for April, 1797.* p. 428.

THE GALLANTRY OF SALADIN AND HIS BROTHER MALEK ADEL.

By Mr. HAMMER.

THE names of *Salaheddin* and *Melek Adel* are of the highest celebrity in our ancient *Chronicles* of the Crusades, and in the historical romances of our own times. They are represented by historians as two great Princes, who inspired terror among the Crusaders by the rapidity of their victories, and gained the hearts of all by their generosity towards those whom they had conquered. In this respect their renown is too well founded to admit of any disbelief; and those aspersions which the spirit of hatred and fanaticism has cast on the memory of Saladin, through some historians of the Crusades,¹ far from tarnishing his true glory, only serve to weaken our faith in their veracity.

¹ *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 1132.

Not content, however, with the picture which History has drawn of the great and brilliant qualities of those princes, our romance writers have thought proper to embellish it; and instead of describing them merely as examples of generosity, courage, and magnanimity, they present them to us now as models of gallantry, delicacy, and chivalrous attention towards the ladies.

Saladin makes a figure in the amours of Eleonore de Guyenne; who nearly risked her own soul that she might save that of her Musulman lover; and *Malek Adel*, whose projected marriage with the sister of Richard Cœur de Lion failed through the intrigues of priests,¹ is become, thanks to Madame Cotin, the most tender, the most refined, the most transcendent of all chivalrous lovers; he is idolized by all women of sensibility, and he has reduced to despair all those men who feel that they are not capable of rivalling him in this amorous heroism.

Quite enchanted with the romantic virtues of this hero, and his success among the ladies, we have endeavoured to conciliate in some degree their approbation, by a diligent search in Arabian manuscripts; hoping to discover in these sources of history some new features, some exploits hitherto unknown, such as might inspire his fair admirers with fresh raptures, and confound the incredulity of all men who entertain any jealousy of his perfections. We must, however, acknowledge the unfortunate result of our labors—instead of radiant plumes with which we hoped to deck this Phoenix of Arabian cavaliers, our researches have produced nothing but disgraceful anecdotes, which reduce him to an heap of ashes, out of which he will not easily be regenerated.

We doubt if the ladies will give credit to our simple assertion—at most they will allow that Madame Cotin has exaggerated a little; but they will insist that she only added some embellishments to a groundwork of real chivalrous virtue. This was, at first, our own opinion; and having turned over a variety of manuscripts, without finding one anecdote in favor of *Malek Adel*'s gallantry, we still persisted in believing him a perfect cavalier, in spite of this fatal silence of the Arabian authors.

But what was our astonishment on discovering, in a classical historian of those times, sonic facts which incontestably prove, that this famous *Melek Adel* was not only destitute of all the superior qualities which have hitherto been ascribed to him; but, on the contrary, that he, a ferocious soldier, and an unmerciful conqueror, was deficient in the slightest attentions paid to the fair sex, even in the country of harems and amongst barbarians; that so far from being the flower of Arabian worthies, or of having any pretensions to that title on account of his delicacy towards the ladies, he invariably treated women ill, and has always been considered among the Asiatics, as one who forgot, in the most interesting situations and circumstances of his life, what every man owes to beauty in distress!

¹ See “Abulfeda.”

His brother *Salah-eddin* is equally guilty in this respect. History, whilst it does justice to their warlike and political merits, has, nevertheless, marked them as two barbarians who always failed on the most essential occasions, in the respect and kindness due to the fairest and the weakest portion of the human race.

But let History declare the facts:—according to an Arabian author¹—“In the year 581 of the Hegira, (of Christ 1185) Salahed-din a second time laid siege to Mossoul. The chief of this city sent to him a solemn embassy, composed of his mother, the daughter of his uncle *Noureddin Mahmoud*, and other women, intreating him to raise the siege and spare their property; but he drove them back and refused to comply with their request; for which shameful conduct all the world blamed him the more, because the daughter of Noureddin Malimoud, (a princess of illustrious blood among the chief families of this time, and to whose father Salaheddin owed many obligations) was one of the supplicants.”

In seventeen years after this occurrence, the harshness of Salaheddin's conduct was punished in his own family, and the blow of retaliation fell upon his mother; but what renders the circumstance still more shocking is, that the blow was given by the hand of his own brother, the Melek Aadel so undeservingly celebrated. The historian *Abulfeda*'s words (according to *Ibn Emir*) are as follows:

“In the year of the Hegira 599 (of the Christian Era 1202) *Aadel* deprived his brother *Afdhal* of the cities of *Sorouje*, *Raas-ain*, and *Qualaton-nedjm*. *Afdhal* sent his mother to *Hama*, and requested that his nephew *Mansour* would send some person with her to wait upon *Aadel*, and endeavour to obtain from him the restitution of his property. *Mansour* deputed to accompany the lady, *Zined-din Ibn Hindi*, the judge: but *Melek Aadel* rejected her supplications, and sent her back in despair.” “Thus,” (observes *Ibn el Attier*, author of the book *Capel*,) “was the family of Salaheddin punished for the misconduct of Salaheddin himself; on that occasion when the females of the illustrious house of the *Atabegs*, and amongst them the daughter of Noureddin, came, during the siege of Mossoul, and threw themselves at his feet without success.”

What a sad discovery for the chivalrous glory of Saladin! and how unworthy does Malek Adel appear of the favors bestowed on his memory by Madame Cotin! Where we had reason to expect that he would prove himself another Coriolanus, we find him disgraced by misconduct towards the females of his own family, and branded with the eternal reproach of history.

This unfortunate discovery has given us much uneasiness—as we feel equally for him and for the ladies of whom he has been hitherto the favorite. We are sometimes rendered so happy by illusions, that it is unpardonable in History to come forward and destroy that *mentis gratissimus error*. We must only request of our fair readers on this occasion to be assured, that our researches have been directed to per-

ronages truly historical, and altogether unconnected with the heroes of romance, those darling objects of female sensibility. Let *Saladin* and *Malek Adel* enjoy in peace the happiness which they can derive from the esteem of our ladies—they are no more the true *Salaheddin* and *Malek-Aadel* than the *Mahomet* of Voltaire is the *Mohammed* of History.

RECHERCHES SUR APOLLON, ET SUR DIVLRS POINTS DE GRAMMAIRE, PAR J. B. GAIL,

Éccluse royal, Membre de l'Institut, et Chevalier de Saint Vladimir.

Recherches sur Apollon λύκειος, λυκοκτόνος, λυκηγενής, λοξίας, τέλειος,
etc., et sur divers points de Grammaire.

RIFN de plus commun dans les écrivains anciens que de rencontrer à la suite du nom d'Apollon, les épithètes λύκειος, λυκοκτόνος et autres. Les savans eux-mêmes, à plus forte raison les commentateurs, ont beaucoup disserte sur cette matière, et ne me paroissent avoir rien conclu de satisfaisant. De nouvelles recherches peuvent-elles sembler oiseuses ? Je ne l'ai pas cru. Je propose en conséquence de nouvelles observations sur le sens de divers attributs d'Apollon, extraites d'une dissertation assez étendue que j'ai composée sur cette matière.

I Λύκειος¹ ou λυκαῖος. On donne à ce mot diverses étymologies : 1.^o celle de λυκός *loup*, étymologie qui rappelle l'oracle d'Apollon, lequel avoit indiqué aux bergers le moyen de détruire les loups (Paus., I. 2, c. 9.); 2.^o celle de λύκη,² *la lumière qui précede le lever*

¹ Λύκαιος, λύκειος, λύκιος. Le très-savant M Belin (dans son Lucien, t. 4. p 80.) juge le premier de forme dorienne; le second, de la langue commune; le troisième, altéré. Pausanias donne le premier, I. 2. c. 9. p. 133; le deuxième et le troisième, I. 1. c. 19 p. 44, 45; le troisième, encore, I. 2. c. 19 p. 152, 153. Sur λύκειος, voyez Pausan. I. 1, et Thesaur. antiq. græc. t. 7 p. 559 au mot λύκεια; II. Estienne, à λύξ et λύκειος; Constantin, à λύκειος; et Vossius, de idolatriâ, I. 2. c. 12.

² Subst qui est primitivement l'adj. fem. de λυκός, *blanc*. Ainsi, chez nous, le subst *aube* vient du femenin, *alba*, *blanche*.

du soleil, le crépuscule du matin (Macrobius, *Saturn. I. i. c. 17*). Mais il est probable que ces deux mots sont de même famille, et ont une commune origine : 'que λύκος vient de λύει,' *crépuscule du matin*; que la dénomination de λύκος *loup*, rappelle l'habitude du loup qui, au crépuscule du matin, va chercher sa proie. Oubliant que presque tous les animaux sont désignés par le son de leur voix, leur taille, la couleur de leur robe, leurs mœurs, leurs habitudes;² oubliant cet usage, et la double signification de soleil et de loup renfermée dans λύκος,³ on aura, en raison de deux étymologies admisses au lieu d'une, établi deux traditions⁴ sur le sens de λύκειος. Les uns y voyant l'étymologie de λύκος *loup*, et adoptant la fable de Pausanias, auront traduit, *Apollon destructeur des loups*. Les autres considérant qu'Apollon est éminemment *le Dieu lumineux, le Dieu soleil*, auront, avec l'ingénieux Macrobius, cru devoir rendre *Apollon Lycien* par *Apollon Dieu du jour, ou Dieu soleil*, et tel est le sens que je donnerois à l'invocation du chœur dans les *Sept Chefs contre Thèbes* par Eschyle, v. 146. sq. On y lit, καὶ σὺ, λύκει' ἄραξ, λύκειος γένους τρεπτῷ θεῖος, et l'on propose, *Dieu jadis destructeur des loups, sois aujourd'hui destructeur*

¹ Et λύκη, de λύω, solvo, aperio.

² Ainsi βάσις (le bœuf), le vaste; δύος (l'âne), le lent, le tardif; πτωξ (le lièvre), le paresseux, etc.

³ *Solem enim λύκον appellari, etiam Lycopolitanum Thebaeum civitatem testimonia esse* (Macrobius, cité par H. Estienne). L'analogie qui existe entre λύκος *loup* et λύκος *soleil*, expliquera pourquoi, en langue celtique (voy. la dissert. de M. Johanneau), le même mot, à peu près, a signifié *loup* et *annee*.

⁴ Je ne parle ici que des deux traditions le plus connues. Il en existe deux autres. D'après l'une, les Athéniens dérivoient le surnom de Lycien, de Lycus, un de leurs heros mythologiques, duquel, à les en croire, les Lyciens de l'Asie avoient emprunté leur nom. Suivant une autre, fondée sur le texte de Sophocle (Ed. t. 212—217), ce que j'appelle le Dieu soleil, seroit le Dieu de Lycie (sentiment de Rochefort); et il faut en convenir, lorsque Pon réfléchit que, dans le même passage, Sophocle nomme λύκει' ἄραξ, et λύκεια ἔρηξ; que Diane se plaît sur les montagnes de Lycie, et que Diane est sœur d'Apollon, on inclineroit à croire avec un Scholiaste, qu'Apollon est appelé Lycien, ou parce qu'il est né en Lycie, ou par allusion aux honneurs que lui rend la Lytie. Mais le moyen de rapprocher cette quatrième tradition de celle qui voit le Dieu soleil dans Apollon Lycien, seroit de supposer que le nom de Lycien rappelle la consécration de la Lytie à Apollon, Dieu soleil, ainsi nommé, dit le Scholiaste précédemment cité, de ce qu'il fait succéder la nuit au jour.

de l'ennemi, ou sois digne de ton surnom de destructeur des loups. Ce sens reçu plaît assez à M. Visconti, qui me permet de le nommer. Mais, je l'avoue, avant de connoître son opinion, j'aurois préféré de traduire, *Dieu Lygien (Dieu du jour, Dieu soleil) montre-toi contre l'ennemi digne de ton surnom de Lygien.* Sous ce nom¹ Apollon à Athènes² étoit représenté portant un arc³ à sa main gauche, et sa droite reployée sur sa tête montre le Dieu, se reposant comme d'une grande fatigue : les traits partis de cet arc, et au siège de Troie,⁴ et ailleurs, avoient ôté la vie⁵ à des milliers de guerriers. C'est donc probablement ce Dieu soleil que le chœur d'Eschyle invoque, et non le Dieu destructeur des loups : c'est le Dieu soleil, le Dieu du jour armé d'un arc d'or,⁶ et d'invincibles traits, et non pas le Dieu destructeur des loups, que pareillement Electre⁷ a invoqué contre cet Egisthe dont elle a juré la mort.

Dans *Oedipe roi*, de Sophocle (v. 71, 212 et pass.), lorsque Thèbes désolée par la peste, invoque Apollon Lygien, peut-il être question d'Apollon tueur, ou destructeur des loups ? N'est-ce pas évidemment le Dieu soleil (Ed. T. 675), ce Dieu purificateur que le chœur invoque avec instance, et si souvent dans le cours de la tragédie ?

De ces deux versions, *Dieu destructeur des loups, Dieu soleil armé de traits*, la première peut très-bien se défendre comme religieuse et mystique,⁸ puisqu'elle se fonde sur une tradition de Pausanias. Mais à cette tradition populaire que cite Pausanias sans la discuter,⁹ et sans y croire peut-être, je crois devoir préférer celle qui enseigne qu'*Apollon Lygien* est synonyme d'*Apollon Dieu soleil*. La dernière seule inspira les poètes, les peintres et les sculpteurs ; et parmi ces derniers, cet artiste (*γέος ἐς θεόν αἰεῖθις*), à qui nous devons l'Apollon vainqueur

¹ Voyez *Musée Français*, par M. Visconti, article *Apollon Lyrien*.

² Ainsi qu'à Argos probablement, ou plutôt, je crois, à Mycènes (Soph. El. 5, sq.); car, dans l'*Electre* de Sophocle, la scène est à Mycènes ; ce que n'admet pas H. Estienne (au mot *λύκειος*) ; tandis que, dans l'*Electre* d'Euripide, la scène est à la campagne près d'Argos.

³ Lucien, dans son *Anach.* de *Gymn.* t. 2, p. 887, l'appelle *τοῦ Αυξίου*, au lieu duquel l'éd. de Florence donne *λυκείου*, leçon approuvée par M. Belin.

⁴ Hom. Il. 1, 45. sq. ; 4, 93 et 119 ; et *passim*, Soph. Oed. t. 212.

⁵ On donne des traits non-seulement au Dieu soleil, mais encore à la lune. Voy. Oed. t. 216, sq. et son Schol. ib.

⁶ Soph. Oed. t. 212. ⁷ Soph. El. 1396. ⁸ Ainsi pense M. Clavier.

⁹ Pausanias en cite plusieurs, sans en garantir aucune.

du serpent Python,¹ chef-d'œuvre fondé sur la fable qu'Apollon, Dieu soleil, avoit un arc et d'invincibles traits, dont il se servoit pour purifier l'air.

II. Λύκειος ἀγορά. D'après ces notions, et autres, λύκειος ἀγορά (Soph. El. v. 7) signifia non pas, *place où l'on avoit mis la statue d'un loup en l'honneur d'Apollon* (explication donnée par Estienne, et adoptée par l'estimable M. Pl.) mais *place lycienne, consacrée à Apollon Lycien (Apollon, Dieu soleil)*.

III. Λύκειον γυμνασίον. Athènes avoit trois Gymnases, l'Académie, le Cynosarge, et le Lycée. Le premier étoit dédié au héros Académus ; le second, à Hercule ; le troisième, le plus illustre de tous, à qui étoit-il consacré ? *A Apollon tueur (intersector luporum, Est.) de loups, ou destructeur de loups*, me répondront deux savans ; l'un d'après Pausanias, l'autre d'après les héroiques de Philostrate. Quant à moi, saisi de la belle idée de λύκειος, *Dieu soleil, c'est encore à Apollon, Dieu soleil, que le Lycée me semble avoir dû être consacré*, et non pas à *Apollon, Dieu tueur de loups*.² Dans le premier Lycée de la plus fameuse des cités savantes, on invoqua sans doute, non pas un Dieu qui tue des loups, mais un Dieu qui éclaire.

IV. Λυκοκτόνος. On le traduit vulgairement par *lupicida (luporum intersector, H. Est.)* ; mais encore ici, je vois le Dieu du jour. M., considérant que je dérive λύκειος de λύκη, *la lumière qui précède le lever du soleil*, m'a objecté que si λύκειος signifie *le Dieu du jour*, λυκοκτόνος signifiera *le Dieu qui tue le jour* ; et qu'alors Apollon seroit le Dieu du jour et de la nuit ; et sa remarque a paru, à quelqu'un, d'une sagacité rare. Mais mon explication ne présente pas la contradiction qu'on lui a prêtée : car, d'après Macrobe, j'ai traduit λυκοκτόνος, non pas, *Dieu qui tue le jour*, mais *Dieu soleil dont la présence efface cette blancheur qui précède le lever du soleil*.

V. Λυκηγενής, ὁ. *Surnom d'Apollon, à cause qu'un loup s'étoit montré à sa mère pendant sa grossesse.* A cette explication donnée par H. Estienne (qui renvoie à Hesych. et à Eustathe), préférerons celle de M. Belin, helléniste très-souvent ingénieux, et de l'illustre M. Heyne.

¹ Quand les eaux du déluge se furent retirées, la terre alors impure infectoit les airs. L'influence bienfaisante du soleil, ou, pour parler plus poétiquement, les flèches d'Apollon la délivrèrent du serpent Python, c'est-à-dire la purgèrent des exhalaisons mortielles dont ce venimeux reptile étoit l'emblème.

² Sur le Lycée d'Athènes, voy. Lucien, l. 1.; *Phil. Jac. Crophii exercitat. de Gymnasiis literariis Atheniensium*; et le *Lex. Xen.* qui le cite.

Ce dernier dérive l'épithète de *λύκη, ὥρης* (*le point du jour*) ; et voit dans l'épithète d'Homère (Il. 1, 101 et 119), l'antique notion d'Apollon, Dieu soleil (*notionem solis in Apolline antiquissimam : est enim sol manè natus, ut dies est ἡμέρα γένεσις* : explication conforme à celle de Macrobe (cité par H. Estienne, au mot *λύκη*), qui donne *γεννῶντα τὴν λύκην, generantem exortu suo lucem*, pour glose de *λυκηγένεα*. Notons dans ce dernier passage, *λύκη* signifiant *la lumière*, en général. Mais n'oubliions pas que dans un sens plus restreint, il se dit de la lumière du matin, du crépuscule du matin.

VI. Λοκάβας, ô, l'année. Encore dans ce mot, je verrois l'idée de lumière et de Dieu soleil ; et, renonçant à l'une des étymologies indiquées par H. Estienne, *παρὰ τὸ λύκων δίκην βαίνειν*, je lui présérerois celle de l'anglais Robertson, à *λύκου*, *it is solis βάσει*.

VII. Λυκαῖον σήκωμα (Eurip. El. 1274), Hiéron en l'honneur d'Apollon Lycien, ou d'Apollon Dieu du soleil. Cet Hiéron, en Arcadie, étoit consacré au Dieu du jour. Les Dioscures (Eurip., ib.) y envoyoient Oreste. Il étoit en effet naturel que le Dieu *Loxias*, par qui il avoit été criminel, lui offrit un asyle.¹ Le substantif qui accompagne *λυκαῖον* mérite bien une note. D'après H. Estienne et autres, on rend *σήκωμα* par *contrepoids qu'on met dans la balance* ; mais pas un mot de sens que je donne à *σήκωμα*, lequel d'après mes idées sur les désinences² en *μα*, je croirois plus expressif que *σηκός*.³

VIII. Λοξίας ou λοξῖης, ô, encore *Dieu du jour*. A ma version on m'oppose ce mot de Lucien,⁴ *semblable à ce Dieu qu'on appelle Loxias, tu ne dis rien que d'obscur*. Mais n'est il pas évident que de deux interprétations données à ce mot à double entente, le Voltaire de son siècle a dû, écartant la notion de *Dieu du jour*, préférer celle qui peint Apollon avec un ridicule, et qui convient davantage au genre caustique, mordant et irréligieux qu'il avoit adopté ? Que l'on saisisse donc avec enthousiasme l'idée d'Apollon, Dieu obscur, dans le sens de Lucien, je

¹ Eurip. El. 1266, sq.; et l'Oreste du même, trag. 1645.

² Voy. mon *Traité des Désinences*, deuxième partie, p. 12.

³ Voy. mes *Observations historiques*, etc., p. 197.— Pollux (IV, 172) donne *σηκώματα ἀντιθεῖναι*. H. Estienne, au lieu d'expliquer la difficulté dans Pollux, se borne à citer la locution. Quant à l'annotateur de Pollux il propose *ἀντιθεῖναι, quæ ponderuntur paria facere*. N'ayant pas le texte qui contient l'*ἀντιθεῖναι*, je ne puis que proposer conjecturalement, *ἀναθεῖναι, consacrer (σηκώματα) des hiérons (à des Dieux)*; ou, sans rien changer, donner à *ἀντιθεῖναι* le sens de *en reconnaissance*.

⁴ Sect. à l'encun, t. 1, p. 554.

ne le trouverai pas mauvais : mais que l'on me pardonne de trouver plus inspirante pour les poètes et les artistes, et plus digne d'Apollon, l'épithète de *Dieu du jour*; et, avec Macrobe, de dériver λοζίς de κύκλος λοζίς, *le zodiaque*. Au reste, je suis loin de juger absurde, encore moins d'accabler d'offensantes et dures personnalités (de parcellles manières me sont étrangères) les partisans de la version, *Apollon obscur dans ses oracles*. Les écrivains sacrés n'ont-ils pas dit du vrai Dieu qu'il étoit souvent *impénétrable*?

IX. Τέλειος. Cette épithète, m'a-t-on objecté, se donne généralement aux grands Dieux. Pour moi, je doute qu'elle doive avoir ce sens dans les passages que j'ai cités.

Ce mot signifiera, 1.^o *parfait*, sens facile et connu même des enfans. 2.^o *Qui ad metam floris juvenilis* (et non *qui ad metam vita*) *perrenit* ; sens que dans mes premières études sur les divers attributs d'Apollon, je n'appliquois pas, et à tort, au Ζεὺς τέλειος d'Apollodore (l. 1, ch. 2). M. Clavier l'adopte avec raison, et avant lui, Lennep, expliquant le passage d'Apollodore, au mot τέλος. Τέλειος est un de ces mots dont le sens ne se détermine que par le contexte. Or, le contexte et les rapports logiques justifient le sens de M. Clavier, qui est celui de Lennep : *Jupiter fut nourri (et non pas élevé) par les Curètes du lait de la chèvre Amalthee, mais parvenu à l'âge viril, etc.* 3.^o Et c'est ici l'acception difficile, τέλειος signifiera, je crois, *le Dieu dont les oracles ont leur accomplissement*; ou bien, *le Dieu qui accomplit, qui exerce, qui conduit une chose à sa fin*: Ainsi dans l'*OEdipe* T. de Sophocle, v. 1353, τελῶν, signifiera, non pas, *Apollo mala conseruit nra* (version de Brumoy); mais, c'est *Apollon qui permet que mes maux s'accomplissent*, des maux prédits par lui contre l'assassin de Laïus (*ib.*, 232, sq.). C'est comme si *OEdipe* avoit dit, Apollon (τελῶν) est contre moi τέλειος.

Dans ce passage d'Eschyle (*Ag.*, 982), où Clytemnestre adresse à Jupiter une prière à double entente, ζεῦ τέλειε, τὰς ἐμὰς εὐγάσ τέλει, τέλειος ne signifiera certainement, ni Dieu parfait, ni Dieu qui est à la fleur de l'âge; mais Dieu qui exerce, qui accomplit, qui conduit un vœu à son parfait et entier accomplissement. Clytemnestre (*ib.*, 1441) qui vient d'assassiner son mari, s'crie : *Ecoutez mon serment, j'en jure τὴν τέλειον τῆς ἐμῆς παιδὸς δικηγ*. Brumoy et autres traduisent, *par la vengeance de ma fille*, et négligent τέλειον, épithète qui n'est nullement oiseuse, et qui signifie, je crois, *la vengeance accomplie (ultionem quæ effectum sortita est)*; ensorte que τέλειος seroit passif ou neutre, tandis qu'il est actif au v. 982.

Φαέθων. Sophocle (El. 826), fait dire au chœur ému des malheurs d'Electre, où donc sont les fondres de Jupiter? où est ὥλιος φαέθων? On traduit, ubi lucidus sol? Pour moi, je croirois pouvoir donner à φαέθων le sens de brûler, et non celui de faire. Ce sens me plairoit, non parce que Servius dérive φαέθων de φάειν lux, et de αἴθω brûler, mais parce que l'analogie le conseille: en effet, la substance du sens et celle de la lumière étant la même, on concevra que φαέθων puisse signifier le brillant,¹ et le brûlant. En outre de l'analogie que pourtant n'appuye aucun exemple, je croirais avoir pour moi le contexte, en partie, du moins. En effet, le chœur demandant au soleil un vengeur, doit penser moins à l'éclat du soleil qu'à ses feux, et à sa faculté de brûler et de châtier.

Dans les huit premiers articles que je viens de discuter; où l'on voyoit le Dieu (*lupicida*, ou *intersector luporum*, II. Estienne); le Dieu destructeur des loups, j'ai présenté continuellement le *Dieu du jour*, le *Dieu soleil*. On a opposé à mon opinion, celle des grammairiens, qui dérivent λύκειος, et λυκοντόνος de λύκος *loup*. Nous avons répliqué que λύκειος et λυκοντόνος dérivent non de λύκος *loup*, mais de λύκη *lumière*; que λύκος signifie *loup* et *soleil*; que lorsqu'il signifie *loup*, il dérive uniquement de λύκη *lumière*; qu'on avoit désigné les animaux par leurs mœurs et leurs habitudes; que la dénomination de λύκος *loup*, vient probablement de l'habitude où est le loup d'aller au crépuscule du matin ou du soir, chercher sa proie; que les images des loups qui existent à présent encore, dans les pays voués jadis au culte d'Apollon, ne prouvent qu'une soumission aveugle à une tradition erronée, une tradition acceptée d'abord par le peuple, et ensuite par les savans eux-mêmes; que cette tradition erronée se conçoit et s'explique aisément chez un peuple aussi ami des fables que le Lycien;² que la tradition que je défends, et qui rappelle le *Dieu soleil*, me paraît noble et inspirante; qu'enfin elle a pour elle le droit d'aînesse (*antiquissimam solis notionem*), ainsi que le remarque un savant d'une grande autorité, M. Heyne.

On conçoit pourtant que les deux acceptations aient trouvé des parti-

¹ Au crépuscule du soir (c'est-à-dire, entre chien et loup), au moment où la couleur du loup ne se distingue pas de celle du chien. Voy. II. Estienne à λύξ et à ἀμφιλύκη; et Macrob. Saturn.

² La Lycie, dit le savant M. Belin (t. 3, p. 549, de son *Lacien*), avoit été le théâtre d'une infinité de fables.

sans ; que les écrivains d'une même époque ayant adopté chacun en particulier la tradition qui lui plaisoit le plus, ou qui convenoit le mieux au genre de ses idées ; que les écrivains mythologues, par exemple, songeant à Apollon, berger d'Admète, ayant vu dans *λυκοκτόνος* le Dieu destructeur des loups ; tandis que les écrivains astronomes, portant leur vue plus haut, auront préféré à une fable la tradition vraie qui avoit rapport à des idées astronomiques.

Dans la mythologie grecque, il existe quantité de faits qui ont une allusion manifeste aux opinions primitives sur les révolutions des astres. On a beau jeter sur elles un voile religieux, la trace de leur origine et de leur altération n'en est pas moins aperçue par les esprits attentifs et accoutumés à réfléchir sur les faits.

C'est ainsi que la fable du serpent Python, que j'ai déjà citée, rappelle, ou l'influence bienfaisante des rayons du soleil sur l'atmosphère qu'il purifie, ou peut-être tout bonnement le dessèchement de quelques marais.

J'ai déclaré ma préférence pour l'une des deux traditions ; je ne m'aviserai cependant pas de me fâcher contre l'opinion contraire, en réfléchissant que le sens de *λύκειος*, *λοξίας*, et autres, pouvoit être problématique dit temps de Périclès.

Un brûteur Corinthien (Thuc., 1, 70, 5), dans son parallèle d'Athènes et de Sparte s'exprime ainsi : *τοῖς μὲν σώμασιν ἀλλοτριωτάτοις ὥπερ τῆς πόλεως χρέωνται, τῇ δὲ γνώμῃ, εἰςειστάτη εἰς τὸ πραστεῖν.* J'ai traduit : *ils offrent à la patrie et leurs corps, comme des biens qui leur seroient tout-à-fait étrangers, et leur ame (γνώμη), comme un patrimoine qu'ils lui consacrent.* Un jeune littérateur blâme *animâ*, de ma version latine, version conforme à la glose de M. Néophyte Douka, et il a tout-à-fait raison : car c'est des facultés intellectuelles (*mens*), et non de l'ame en général (*animâ*), qu'il est ici question ; mais il n'a pas également raison, lorsqu'il donne à *γνώμη*, le sens de génie. Ce seroit faire beaucoup trop d'honneur au peuple d'Athènes que de lui accorder (*en masse*, qu'on me pardonne cette expression), le génie qui n'est, le partage que de quelques êtres privilégiés. Il n'a pas raison non plus, lorsqu'il voit dans *γνώμη* une allusion au génie des grands hommes d'Athènes. Thucydide qui dans le membre précédent (*τοῖς σώμασιν ἀλλοτριῶν*, parle de tous les Athéniens en général, n'a pu dans le membre qui suit, penser à quelques Athéniens en particulier. Voici au reste ma conjecture sur le passage de Thucydide. " Les Athéniens, quand " il s'agit de combattre pour la patrie, sacrifient leurs corps, comme

“ s'il leur étoit absolument étranger : mais quand il faut délibérer sur ce que l'on doit faire pour le salut de l'Etat, ils tiennent fortement à leur opinion (*γνώμη*), comme à un bien qui leur est propre.”

EXCURSION

Sur le *γνώμη*, attribué, à tort, je crois, à Hérodote, par deux savans illustres, MM. Larcher et Wytténbach.

LE *γνώμη* de Thucydide me rappelle le *γνώμην* que MM. Larcher et Wytténbach attribuent à Hérodote (1, 31), dans l'histoire de Cléobis et Biton. J'ai cru devoir rappeler et défendre, dans ma *Dissertation sur les Hiérons des anciens*, l'ancienne leçon *ρωμην*. “ *ρωμην* (dis-je alors, p. 182, sq.), que l'on rejette, et que cependant fortifie le voisinage de *νεγνιέων*, me paroît à préférer. Les hommes louent la force des deux jeunes gens (*τὴν ρώμην*) : les femmes plus sensibles, *leur bon cœur* (*οὐσι τεκναν εὐήρησε*). Ainsi, Hérodote donne à chacun des sexes le rôle qui lui convient. Lisez *γνώμην*, (que je crois fort peu grec dans le sens de *bon naturel*), vous ôtez à Herodote une beauté ; et de plus, vous lui attribuez une rédonnance, puisque vous lui faites dire que les hommes louoient le bon naturel, et les femmes le bon naturel de Cléobis et Biton.”

Mes raisons ne furent point goûtées : elles furent presque traitées de paralogisme et d'hérésie littéraire. Mais elles recevront une nouvelle force du témoignage de Pausanias, qui (I. 2, c. 19, p. 153), rappelant l'héroïsme de Cleobis et Biton, lui fait un mérite, non de *leur bon naturel* (sens, je le répète, que je vois bien faiblement indiqué par *γνώμην*), mais de *leur force* (*ρωμην*), mot qu'il fortifie encore d'*ἰσχύος*. *ὑπὸ ρώμης τε καὶ ισχύος*.

‘*Τυφῆτης* (*l'une des épithètes d'Apollon*), et *πεφήτης*, sont-ils synonymes, me demande un élève de l'Ecole Normale, maintenant professeur ? Voici ma réponse.

I. ‘*Τυφῆτης*. Rochefort, t. 1, p. 16 de son Sophocle, le rend par *prophète*, et l'estimable M. Planche, par *interprète de la Divinité*. La dernière version se trouve conforme à l'*interpres Deorum* de Camérier, cité par H. Estienne. Cependant en considérant la préposition *ὑπὸ*, je croirois plus exact de traduire, en parlant d'Apollon, par exemple, *Dieu qui rend des oracles sous un autre* (*ὑπὸ*), qui rend des oracles

que lui communique un Dieu supérieur. L'analogie conseille ce sens, et de plus des exemples le confirment. Qu'Apollon rendit des oracles, non d'après lui, mais d'après Jupiter, c'est ce que nous apprend l'ancien Scholiaste de Sophocle (Ed., t. 151) : ὁ γὰρ Ἀπόλλων ὑποφήτης! δοκεῖ εἶναι τοῦ πατέρος, καὶ παρ' ἐκσινοῖς λαμβάνειν τὰς μαντείας; καὶ τοῖς εἰδέναις ἐκφέγεται: c'est ce que nous enseigne une autorité bien supérieure encore, celle de Sophocle lui-même, qui, parlant d'un oracle rendu solennellement par Apollon lui-même, s'écrie : *ὁ δούλος oracle de Jupiter* (Soph., Ed., t. 151). Je viens d'avertir du sens de ὑποφήτης dans un cas déterminé. Peut-être, en d'autres cas, auroit il le sens d'*interprète*: ce dont pourtant je doute, et doit peut-être aussi douteront ceux qui n'aiment pas plus qu'eux moi les à peu près. Le sens d'*interprète* (*des oracles*, par exemple), conviendra mieux (quelquefois) à προφήτης.

H. Estienne. Quelquesfois, dit H. Estienne, προφήτης sera pour ἡγεμόνης. M'interdisant ici toute excursion philologique, je n'invoquerai que l'analogie, et je dirai : προφήτης signifie prophète, qui prédit l'avenir (τοὔτο); et comme ce prophète ne parle pas d'après lui-même, en le considérant comme parlant d'après une inspiration, je l'appellerai ἡγεμόνης, mais ces deux mots ne sont pas, pour cela, synonymes, comme le prouve mon explication. Voy. M. Barthélémy, (Augst., t. 2, p. 441), sur le sens qu'on attachoit à prophètes.

CRITICAL NOTICE OF

COLLATIO VERSORUM SYRIACORVM quam PESCHITO vocant cum Fragmentis in Commentariis Ephraemi Syri obviis instituta a M. Gottlieb Leberecht Spohn, Catecheta ad Eddam Petrinam et Societatis Philobiblicae Socio. Lipsiae 1783. 4to. pp. 28.

We notice this work, partly on account of its rarity in this country, but principally because it contains some very valuable materials for a work which is much wanted; a correct edition of the Syriac version of the Old Testament with various readings.

* Apollon parloit d'après Jupiter. Donc il étoit son *verbe*, terme que j'ai employé dans mon Xénophon (t. 7, p. 320), mais que je dois condamner, 1.^o parce qu'il rappelle λόγος, mot consacré dans la philosophie platonicienne, mais que n'emploie pas le Scholiaste; 2.^o parce que ce mot étant consacré dans notre religion, ne doit s'employer ailleurs qu'avec réserve.

Respecting the general value of the version, there seems to be among the chief Biblical Critics but one opinion, which is, that it ranks among the best, as well as the most ancient: but its utility is unquestionably much diminished by the numerous corruptions of its text. Of all the versions, indeed, which are extant, the Septuagint and Vulgate excepted, it has been most exposed to corruption: and when it had passed through the dangerous period antecedent to the invention of printing, and appeared likely to meet with some skilful physician, who might heal its wounds, and restore it to its original sanity, it unfortunately fell into the merciless hands of GABRIEL SIONITA. In him were united all the disqualifications which could possibly join to unfit a man for the office of an editor: careless, ignorant, and conceited, he has altered some things from rashness, some from inattention, and more from ignorance: but fortunately, we possess in the Arabic version, which was made from the Syriac, a tolerably sure means of discovering his errors. The judgment of the late Professor Michaëlis (undoubtedly the best Syriac Scholar of his day,) respecting Sionita was remarkably severe: in every page of his valuable grammar he speaks of him in the language of contempt.

In ancient MSS. as is well known to all who are versed in Paleography, the diacritical mark which distinguishes Dolath from Rish (ן – ר) is often omitted, “ unde alii male puncta supplementibus multa varietas lectionis, maxime in nominibus propriis. Innumerā scriptio[n]is vitia hinc orta, socordiæque Gabrielis Sionitæ accepta referenda, versionem Syriacam prisci fæderis in Polyglottis Parisiensibus et Londinensisbus inquinarunt, ut in quæstione critica, fueritne nomen proprium Hebraico per נ an per נ scriptum, versioni Syriacæ, qualis nunc Gabrielis culpa est, non solum non mediocris sed plane nulla fides sit.”¹

Jud and Nun (י – נ) which differ merely in size, have also been frequently changed: “ hanc ergo legem sibi rogent critici, si in codicis Hebraicæ lectione dijudicanda quæsto sit de litera Jod vel nun, nullam esse auctoritatem Syriacæ versionis, atque ex hac quidem sola ne lectionem quidem variam textus Hebraicæ, quæ Jod pro Nun aut Nun pro Jod habeat, cōminisceandam; solus si incedat Syrus, merum sphalma librariorum esse. Nec in nominibus

¹ Michaëlis Grammat. Syr. p. 5. 4to. Hale 1784.—Hence Kennicott in a note on Chon. xi. 38. loses a part of his argument which is to prove that חנני not חנני is the true reading: he urges that the Syriac reads חנני; but this authority is of no consequence, as we have seen above; חנני is certainly the right reading, as the Arabic version proves by reading غنني: this too supports the Syriac, which, were it not for the consent of the Arabic, would not have the slightest weight: indeed in a question of this nature, they amount only to the authority of one.

propriis solum, sed et aliis in verbis idem mendum frequens, elegans nonnunquam et bonam fundens sententiam, sed tamen mendum. Jobi. v. 12. pro Hebraico יְגַנֵּב (*furtim allatum est*) Syriacum legens ﴿رسٰنٰهُ﴾ (*responsum est*), et xxx. 17. pro נָקַרְתִּי eroduntur vel erodunt vermes ossa mea, وَمَعْنَى gravia sunt mihi ossa mea, prope certum habebit, Syrum ibi ﴿رسٰنٰهُ﴾ scripsisse, hic وَمَعْنَى erodunt. Vetus quidem uterque error, in illo jam exemplo Syriaco commissus, ex quo Arabs Jobum vertit: est et bona sententia, elephantiasi enim laborantibus ossa ipsa gravia atque oneri sunt. Verum variam lectionem Textus Hebraici hic ex Syro exsculpere magnæ esset incogitante, cum et 'Hebraicum figura sit dissimillimum, nec facile, ut in Syriaco, errori locus.'¹¹

In the MSS. from which the Syriac version was taken, the vowel points were generally omitted, and were only employed in such words as might have some want of perspicuity, were they omitted: Sionita, however, with immense labor, every where added them, in doing which, as might be expected, he has often made mistakes. "Vetere Testamento Syriaco si quis uti voluerit, hoc statim ante omnia statuat, punctorum vocalium nullam omnino esse auctoritatem: e. g. Job. xviii. 17. ne putet Syrum tam fuisse vecordem, ut يَوْمَ verterit صَنْعَةً *creaturam*, sed efferat حَذَرَةً *desertum*, ut et Arabs ex Syro سَهْلٌ vertit. Sic, et gravius, non censurabile"

tum, non sexcentis, sed innuméris locis a turpi editore erratum, nec tam inscrita, quam summa socordia."¹²

These defects, however, do not diminish the value of the Version as it originally stood, and ought only to incite us to greater exertions to restore it to its original purity. For this work, the tract before us contains some very valuable materials, although mixed with some of the refuse which must of course exist in every collection of various readings.—The Syriac version might, we conceive, be restored to a state of purity with less labor than most other works of the kind: it has been seldom transcribed, because used in a very small tract of country; the MSS. therefore may be expected to be tolerably correct: an Arabic Version has been made from it, which will often point to the true reading as we have seen: and it has been cited by many writers, fathers of the Eastern church, whose works still exist, and when compared with the writings of the Greek Fathers, present an almost uncorrupted text. Ephraem Syrus, the most eminent of these, has left many Commentaries on Scripture, in the course of which he cites innumerable passages: Spolin, a very eminent German critic, has from

¹¹ Michaelis Grammat. Syr. p. 6.

¹² Michaelis Grammat. Syr. p. 25.

this source drawn many valuable readings : his researches, indeed, are confined to the first twenty two chapters of Isaiah ; but it is much to be wished that he had examined the whole of the version by this test.

In this country the tract is very scarce : the copy lying before us is the only one we have ever seen. As the Continent, however, is now open, we thought it might be useful to mention its existence : as it deserves a place in the library of every one, who would criticise on the Syriac version.

Since various readings of the Syriac version are so remarkably scarce and difficult of access, we take the present opportunity of adding a few, which were extracted by Professor Adler from a Syriac MS. of the Gospels, written in the year 548, and published in his *Versiones Syriacæ* (4to. 1789.). Schaaf's edition is the standard, with which he collated the MS.

Schaaf

MS.

Matt. i. 19.	جَنْدِبٌ	جَنْدِبٌ
— 21.	أَكْبَرٌ	أَكْبَرٌ
— 23.	أَكْبَرٌ جَنْدِبٌ	أَكْبَرٌ جَنْدِبٌ
— ii. 6.	صَفَّا	صَفَّا
— 9.	بَرَادِلٌ	بَرَادِلٌ
— iii. 4.	سَلَمَتَنَوْ	سَلَمَتَنَوْ
— iv. 2.	أَطْعَمَ	أَطْعَمَ
— 4.	بَلَدٌ	بَلَدٌ
— 6.	رَوْبَرٌ	رَوْبَرٌ
— 19.	صَنْعَنَ	جَنْدِبٌ
— 21.	أَنْمَنَ	سَهَّلٌ omittitur.
v. 5.	أَوْدَنٌ	أَوْدَنٌ
— 6.	كَحْبٌ	كَحْبٌ
— 13.	MS. سَوْلَةٌ & سَلَمَتَنَوْ without Jud. final.	سَوْلَةٌ & سَلَمَتَنَوْ without Jud. final.
— 17.	أَمْنَنٌ	أَمْنَنٌ
— 19.	سَعْنَانَ	سَعْنَانَ
— 20.	أَيْمَنٌ	أَيْمَنٌ
— ib.	أَلَبَّ	أَلَبَّ
— 22.	سَلَلَ طَنَنَ	سَلَلَ طَنَنَ
— 24.	خَلَلَ طَبَشَنَ	خَلَلَ طَبَشَنَ
— 32.	كَلَّيْنَ	كَلَّيْنَ
— 42.	عَدَنَ بَرَادِلٌ	عَدَنَ بَرَادِلٌ
— 47.	مَأْنَنَ	مَأْنَنَ

Matt. vi. 1. μέτο	μέτο
— — 3. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ
— — 5. ορθαίνω	ορθαίνω
— — 13. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ
— — 21. εἰς οὐν πεπλεύ	εἰς οὐν πεπλεύ
— — 30. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ
— viii. 3. μέτο	μέτο
— — 11. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ
— — 12. πεπλεύ?	πεπλεύ?
— — 13. πεπλεύ?	πεπλεύ?
— ih. οι πεπλεύται:	οι πεπλεύται:
— — 14. πεπλεύται	deest.
— — 17. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ
— — 23. πεπλεύται?	πεπλεύται?
— — 25 & 27. πεπλεύ	πεπλεύ

Some very valuable readings of a Cod. Guelpherbitanus collated by Bruns, may be found in Eichhorn's "Repertorium für Biblische und Morgenländische Litteratur," vol. xv. which frequently agree with those Adler has found in the Vatican MS.

AN ANSWER TO
A LATE BOOK
*Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley,
relating to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus.*
TOGETHER WITH AN EXAMINATION OF MR. BENNET'S
APPENDIX TO THE SAID BOOK.

LONDON : PRINTED IN THE YEAR, 1699.

No. V.—Continued from No. XXI. p. 160.

*To the Author of the Remarks upon Dr. Bentley's Fragments
of Callimachus.*

V. Num. 128. Suppose it were read thus, ἀνέστ τε ἐδεῖσθαι, et si-
lentes sedere, Hesych. ἀνέστ : ἥσυχοι, ἄψων. And the Pythagorean
silence is too well known to be disputed. [P. 72.]

W. 'Twould be a dangerous thing for a person of that old Comic Poet, Philemon's Constitution, to read such a piece of Criticism as this. [V. Lucian. *Maspuβ_ versus fin.*] Or was it your design to print a Banter upon yourself? For had a man premeditated how to write learned nonsense, he could not have done it more effectually. The Fragment here spoken of is taken from A. Gellius, lib. 4, c. 11, who introduces it thus, *Opinio veteris falsa occupavit & convaluit, Pythagoram-- It hath been of a long time a current tradition, but false, that Pythagoras the philosopher abstained from eating the flesh of animals, and from beans.* 'Twas in conformity to this vulgar error, that Callimachus wrote these two verses.

Καὶ καύμων ἀπὸ χείρας ἔχειν ἀνάγκην ἔδεσθαι

Κάγω, Ηὐθαγόρας ὡς ἐκέλευτε, λέγω.

In the first of these lines the word *ἀνάγκην* is a manifestly false Lecture, and makes no possible sense. So that there being a necessity of some correction, Stephanus gives it thus, *ἔχειν* [καὶ ἀνάμον] *ἔδεσθαι*, Dr. Bentley thus, *ἔχειν* [*ἀγάνακτα τ]* *ἔδεσθαι*. These two corrections of the Dr. and Stephanus agree in exactly the same sense; and which offers the less violence to the Text, the eye may judge. After them both comes our judicious Vindicator with his correction. And what's that? why, *ἀρεού τε ἔδεισθαι*, et silentes sedere: for *ἀρεοι* in Hesychius is *ἀρηοι*, silentes; and the Pythagorean silence is too well known to be disputed. But, good Sir, what signifies the Pythagorean silence to the Pythagorean abstinence, the only thing here spoken of, which you are content to drop as nothing to the purpose. 'Tis a wonder to me how such a piece of criticism should enter into an head that has brains in it. A. Gellius is producing a couple of verses directly relating to Pythagoras his supposed abstinence from flesh: by the help of your correction they no more relate to it, than they do to his golden thigh. What an easie thing were it for me here to ask you an insulting question or two! but I'll not be unmannerly.

V. I am sure *ἀβίωτος* in Dr. Bentley's sense is a pure Anglicism, and I cannot think that Callimachus pretended to our language.

W. Were I the spitefullest man that ever took pen in hand, I could not retort this accusation upon you. I must do you that justice to confess, that of all the books I have ever seen in our language, I never yet read one with fewer Anglicisms in it than yours. That the signification here given to the word *ἀβίωτος* is uncommon, Dr. B. owns; [Rara quidem, fateor, est ea verbi significatio: sed, &c.] but withal observes, that Callimachus was a great innovator in language; and that Suidas after the more common interpretation of the word, gives it this less usual one: *ἀβίωτος, δη μή ζωτ.* Callimachus therefore being a great innovator in language, and Suidas having manifestly some-where or other met with this word used in this sense; 'tis not improbable, but that in writing his Lexicon he might have this very passage of Callimachus in his eye: an author whom he refers to more than once without express mention of his name, v.d. supr. et speciation Suidam, v. παναρπήσ, conf. cum Dr. B. n. 48.

V. Num. 200. Dr. Bentley reads it, *καὶ μάστις, &c.* et solus adolescentum comeciebat tutorem, (one of the worst of crimes and worthy the Dr.'s considering.)

W. What a biting parenthesis is here? Wit and satyr all over. But suppose a man should ask you the question; what thought, Sir, what meaning had you in your mind when you wrote it down? Could you answer him?

V. But suppose we read, *καὶ Κρότος αἰξῶν ἔγρ. κηδ.*

W. But suppose there be no such Greek word as *αἰξῶν*, then I suppose we must not read it so. [*ἀειξών* there is, not *αἰξών*. I question, whether *αι* be ever contracted into *ai*.] And if you cannot maintain your *αἰξῶν*, then your *Krotos* falls to the ground of course, and with *Krotos* your Julius Firmicus, and with Julius Firmicus your known story of Saturn's devouring the immortal infants before they were a day old. And thus I think your second correction is as insignificant as your first was ridiculous.

To fetch in the rest of those learned observations of your own, I must return to the beginning of your indictment.

V. Dr. B.'s correction of Fulgentius Planciades was needless. [P. 35.]

W. That correction was none of the Dr.'s. The Dr.'s words are, *viri eruditissimis emendant.* So that if it was needless, those learned men are to blame, not Dr. B.: But why was it needless?

V. For why should he cite a faulty edition?

W. The Dr. cites it from the edition of Jos. Mercerus, Par. 8vo. 1613. which all men of learning esteem as the best edition of that author. Gothofred did well in correcting the sense of his author, but in supplanting his words, and making his own conjecture (though just) part of the text of his author, he exceeded the bounds of a commentator. The Dr. could have done the like upon *Malela*; but he better understood the laws of criticism. Another little shrivell'd observation you have here, at which I cannot afford to make a stop. Perhaps there's nothing in it.

If any bookseller's shop in town could present me with a page more fruitfull of mistakes than is your 38th and 39th, it must be Mr. Bennett's; but I'll defie even his to match you here. Passing by your unintelligible (I am sure 'tis so to me) story of that old edition (you are speaking of *Hephæstion*) and this last; and your idle cavil upon a scape of the Dutch Printer, in putting a *v* for an *u*, I come to your own remarks, or at least those which you espouse and make your own.

V. The Dr.'s quotation out of *Terentianus Maurus* was long since cited by Lactantius in his Notes on *Statius his Thebæ*, [P. 38. Lib. 3. v. 479.] and much more correctly, and to better purpose, thus, Branchi meminit *Terentianus de metris*,

Hymnum Branchiadæ Phœbo.—

W. Let the reader, if he pleases, see it at length in your book, and compare it with the Dr.'s out of *Terentianus himself*, n. 36.

Much more correctly, you say, and to better purpose. How a quotation could be more incorrectly given, and to less purpose, is scarce to be imagined. If any mortal can make either sense or grammar of it, as it stands in that Lactantius, I'll lose the whole cause.

V. For as the verses are now read, I cannot excuse them: Chronology itself cannot defend them. [P. 39.]

W. Chronology! — Stuff.

V. For Branchus could not sing an Hymn of Callimachus. [Ibid.]

W. Nor could you construe Terentianus, which therefore I'll do for you.

Nec non et memini, pedibus quater his repetitis,

Hymnum Battiadem Phœbo cantasse Jovique

Pastorem Branchum: quem —

Nec non et memini, and I also remember, Battiadem, that Callimachus, cantasse, composed, Hymnum, pastorem Branchum, an Hymn (called) Branchus the shepherd, pedibus quater his repetitis, with these Choriambick feet four times repeated, Phœbo Jovique, in praise of Jupiter and Apollo. And though Chronology will not admit Branchus, who liv'd so many years before Callimachus, to have sung an Hymn composed by Callimachus, yet Callimachus may have composed an hymn in praise of Jupiter and Apollo, and given to that hymn, from 'tis probable, the principal fable of it, the title of Branchus. And of that very numerical hymn there is scarce any doubt to be made, but that this fragment was part, and probably the first verse, it being in that Metre Terentianus speaks of, and with express mention of Jupiter and Apollo.

Δαι μόνες εῦ-ύμνοτά τοι - φέι βέ τε καὶ - Ζεῦ Διδύμων - γενῆρχατ.

Here's the Pentameter, which Hephaeston and Terentianus speak of, after the 4 Choriambics ending in a Bacchius.

V. Branchus, says the same commentator, [Ibid.] was a Thessalian. Branchus Thessalus fuit, dilectus Apollini — illime Branchiades Apollo dictus.

W. But here this same beloved commentator of yours is no less than twice mistaken. First; Branchus was not a Thessalian, but a Milesian: vide inter Historie Poetice scriptores Conon. Narrat. 33, & 44. and Bernartius in loc. takes notice of Lactantius (al. Lactantius) as the only authority for Branchus his having been a Thessalian. [Statii oper. Par. 4to. 1618, Vol. 1. p. 143.] Not secondly, was Apollo ever call'd Branchiades, though you will find it so in some Lexicographers and Epithet-mongers, into whose hands it first came from this Lactantius, and so pass'd downward by transcription. I find it in Hoffmann, but Baudrand hath rectified this mistake. For Apollo to have been called Branchiades, or rather Branchides, he must have been the son, not the father of Branchus. For that termination — *iδης* or — *ιδης* determines the Patronymick to the descendants. There was indeed an Oraculum called from the successors of Branchus Βραγχίδαι or Βραγχίδης: but Apollo, as related to that oracle, took his name from the place of it, Didymæus. As is imply'd in this very fragment.

V. I question not therefore, but that Branchiades is the better reading. [Ibid.]

W. And I ask little question, but that the reading Branchiades is most ridiculously absurd.

V. It carries its own credentials with it. [Ibid.]

W. It carries its own confutation with it. It is against Grammar, Chronology, and common sense; has been long since condemned by Brodæus in his notes on the Anthology, lib. 3. cap. 23. and by Nic. Brissæus Montevillarius in his notes upon the passage in Terentianus now produced, Paris, 4to. 1531. Never, I believe, approved of by any man before your self.

V. Nor is there any need of playing the corrector, and changing quom into quem. [Ibid.]

W. So much need of it, that without changing quom into quem (an easie change) there's no construing those lines.

V. And to this head I question not, but the quotation, p. 337. in the Dr.'s collection ought to be referred. [Ibid.]

W. And upon this point I question not, but that you are again as much as ever mistaken. For most certain it is, that that quotation cannot belong to this head. For this Poem called Βράγχος was all of it written in that sort of Pentameter just before mentioned, and therefore the quotation, p. 337. which is Hexameter, cannot belong to this head. As Virgil's Tityrus being all of it written in long verse, that cluster of short ones, sic vos non vobis — cannot belong to his Tityrus. Had you construed that Greek you transcribed to the press in the page just before, you could not have fallen into this mistake. Καὶ τῷ πενταμέτρῳ Καλλίμαχος δὲ "ΟΛΟΝ ποίησα τὸν Βράγχον συνθῆκε, Δαίμονες ἐν—[P. 38.]

I think you have made me work enough in one page: what have we in the next? why another, 'I question not.'

V. The book (*Nόμιμα Βαρβαρικὰ*) was written, (I question not) after the example of Aristotle, whose treatise under that title is cited by Varro. [P. 40.]

W. This is brought in for no other end or purpose, but to create in the reader a good opinion of your learning. And therefore purely for the humour-sake, I shall tell him that this learned remark is Scaliger's in his notes upon Varro, which our Vindicator, without naming his benefactor, has confidently made his own. And yet whether or no Varro did indeed cite any Treatise of Aristotle under that title, is still a question. The copies of Varro have it *Nomina*, and the *Nomina* is but a conjectural emendation of Scaliger, which though not improbable, yet is it not altogether unquestionable. See the fore-mention'd Mau-saci Dissert. Critic. in Harpocrat.

V. Natalis Comes, n. 45.

W. I'll have no concerns with Natalis Comes, supr. [P. 45.]

V. Joannes Franciscus Trincavellus, -- Victor Trincavellus, -- Cardinal Bembo, -- with a Tristich.

W. A Tristich, beginning with a short verse, sed vid. supr.

V. The Dr. hath, I doubt not, studiously omitted those entire epigrams which had been collected by [Himself and] others—

W. Here the [Himself and] is added in your second edition; the only instance I have observed in you of a second thought. But a strange kind of omission this, methinks; the omission of the epigrams collected by himself: and n. b. collected by himself: q. d. not by others, ergo the collection his own, ergo, not stole. Your meaning, I suppose, is, he studiously omitted the inserting these entire epigrams among the fragments, and, to conceal the fraud, placed the entire epigrams among the entire epigrams. Studiously, I doubt not. • This ought to have been referred to the class of transports, supr.

V. A critick so curious in what did not belong to his poet. [P. 50.]

W. The name of Callimachus did belong to his poet: which name therefore being falsely ascribed to a wrong person, 'twas no unnecessary curiosity in the Dr. but full to the subject he was upon, to rectifie that mistake: for which a man less litigious than your self would have thanked him.

V. The Dr. might have been so carefull as to have acquainted the learned world with what was genuine and presumed to be truly his author's. [Ibid.] *

W. Which the Dr. hath amply done. But is that Latin epigram you are here speaking of in Mr. Juret's collection of Epigrammata veterum genuine, and truly Callimachus's? If you can have had any other meaning in this than purely the contradicting Dr. Bentley, it must have been a very silly one: and in that you all along come off so scurvily, I hope we shall hear no more of you. *

V. Natalis Comes, Καλλάπη σοφίην. [Ibid.]

W. I tell you again, I'll have nothing to do with Natalis Comes.

V. Mr. Stanley having ——— [P. 51.]

W. Here begins a paragraph, but where it ends I know not, nor how to construe it. 'Tis big of accusations against the Dr.

V. Mr. Stanley reckons the Dr.'s n. 142. among the fragments of the epigrams; which seems very likely.

W. But for what reason, sir, doth it seem so? I see none.

V. And that the title of this epigram was ἐπὶ τῆς Λεοντεῖου δορᾶς, as Suidas averrs. [Ibid.]

W. Whether your meaning be, upon the skin of a lion, or upon the skin of Leontius, (for either or neither of these you may mean, for ought I know) Suidas averrs neither the one nor the other. The Greek preposition *ἐπί*, sir, in this place signifies de (de pelle) not in (in pelle). And all that Suidas averrs, is, that the word *σκύλος* is sometimes apply'd to the skin of a lion, or that the skin of a lion is sometimes called in Greek by the name of *σκύλος*. For which signification of the word he produces the authority of Callimachus in this fragment. This is all that Suidas means, sir, by his *ἐπὶ τῆς λεοντεῖου δορᾶς*.

V. As his despised *Æmilius Portus* had corrected his author.

W. 'Tis no presumption in Dr. Bentley to despise *Æmilius Portus*,

V. Dr. Bentley takes it from *Æmilius Portus*. [Ibid.]

W. Dr. Bentley takes it not from *Æmilius Portus*.

V. Not to mention the Doctor's changing *σκύλος* into *σκύλον*. [Ibid.]

W. The Dr. does not change *σκύλος* into *σκύλον*. This fragment stands in two authors: in Suidas, and in the Scholiast on Sophocles. In Suidas it is given with the word *σκύλος*; and therefore with the word *σκύλος* from Suidas did Mr. Stanley transcribe it. In the Scholiast on Sophocles it stands with the word *σκύλον*; and so from him hath the Dr. given it. So that the Dr. did not change *σκύλος* into *σκύλον*, but as he found it in his author; so without any change at all he wrote it down.

V. Whereas both words are genuine.

W. And therefore the Dr. might use either of them. Qu. Is not this cavilling?

V. That the reader may judge whether the corrections, Ἀλητιάδαι, η, Ἐφύρη, be Dr. Bentley's, [P. 52.] I will transcribe the Fr. n. 103. from the MSS. [MS. write like a scholar.]

Kαὶ μὲν Ἀλητιάδαι ποῦλν χερσότερον.

Tόρδε παρ' _____.

W. I do judge that Dr. Bentley took not those corrections from Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the Ἀλητιάδαι, the verse required that Lection, and I do judge that Dr. Bentley knew the rules of the Greek Prosody before he saw Mr. Stanley's MS. As for the other two corrections (η and Ἐφύρη) the Dr. hath many very material variations from your MS. upon which variations from your MS. those two corrections altogether depend; in conjunction with which therefore they must have been made. The Dr. comes nearer to Junius his Lection, than to that of your MS. [Had Junii Animad. lib. 4. c. 21.] And therefore if we must suppose him to have been beholding to either of them, it was to the former. [Gruter, vol. 4.] The mistaken Lection of your MS. χερσότερον, lin. 1. τόρδε, lin. 2. make its true Lection Ἐφύρη lin. last of no use, and in the same last line the Lection ἀγωνισται, (as you have given it) can never be brought to bear either sense or construction. But the Dr. having established every one of his Lections upon reasons and authorities rendering them certain, hath thereby made all the parts of the fragment consistent, and given a very learned and perspicuous explication of it; which according to the Lections of your MS. could never have been done. So that upon the whole, my judgment is, that the Dr. was no more beholden to Mr. Stanley for his Ἀλητιάδαι, η and Ἐφύρη here, than he was for his Ἐκάλη, δέιδρεον and βουνοσόος before. [Supr.] But this is the way of you; 'tis but arming forth your pages with a set of Greek words against the Dr. and throwing them off with a confident turn; and so, with your readers, the work's done.

V. The reader is left [Ibid.] to compare the Dr.'s n. 71. out of Suidas, beginning with these words, — οὐδὲ τὸ γράμμα, &c. with the same fragment in Mr. Stanley's MS. beginning with these words, ηδέσθη δ'

νέδε τὸ γράμμα λέγον; and to pass his judgment upon the Dr.'s assertion, *Quae antea corruptissima felicitè nunc restituimus.*

W. And my judgment is, that the Dr. had very good grounds for his assertion. Dr. Bentley's Lection comes much nearer to the text in Suidas; and there be almost as many flaws as lines in Mr. Stanley's. He begins with a too licentious inversion of the order of the words; his second line *Τιὸν Αἰτηπετῶν* — were there no exception lay against the grammar of it, runs, methinks, very heavy and impoetical.

Τιὸν Αἰτηπετῶν καὶ ποὺς τὸν Κριών ἀρδα.

The word *κριών* would not make *κριώνος* verse 4th, but *κρίωνος*. The conjunct *ἀὶσα* (so I suppose it should have been printed) seems in this place somewhat too impetuous for the verb *ἀλεσθεῖν*, to which it cleaves, besides that it is a farther departure from the text (*αἴσα*); instead of which, the Dr.'s interjection of lamentation *αἴ!* seems to be demanded by that expression of Suidas *ΟΙΚΤΙΖΕΤ ΛΙΔΑΛΛΙμαχος τὸ ἄθεμον ἔργον*, which I take to be as much as miserabiliter representat. What Mr. Stanley means here by his *μεγάλας σκοτάδας*, I know not. But Dr. Bentley hath given us a fair account of his *μεγάλους Σκοτάδας*. Such is the justice which is done to the manes of the deceased, when their papers are put into the hands of them that know not how to use them. But 'tis no imputation to any man that his first thoughts are not correct.

Besides, Sir, if Dr. Bentley were such a plagiary as you would have us believe of him, what a prize had here been for him? And why did he not make hast off with it, and forthwith to beating about again for more prey? That's the way of them that live upon the plunder. What another instance have you here given us of your unskillfull management? So often telling us of his transcribing your MS. ! So fully demonstrating how little he regarded it? The character upon which you spend the former part of your book, a most superecilious corrector, is not very consistent with what you give us in the latter part of it, a most notorious plagiary. Who'd imagin both these belonged to the same man?

V. In n. 86. the correction of *Διαγόρας Μίλιας*, was long since made to his hands. [P. 56.]

W. Nor doth the Dr. lay any claim to that Correction. But the observation that that fault in the copies of Plutarch had been of so long standing as to have misled Eusebius and Theodoret (the former of which *Præp. Evang.* l. 13. and the later *Therapeut. Græc.* Ser. 2. follow that corrupt Lection of *Διαγόρας οἱ Μίλιασιοι*) and consequently the rectifying the mistakes of those ancient writers, this was the Dr.'s own.

V. And whether *Χάλκαιον* be not a genuine reading, and *ψυττεῖ* be not as likely as *ψήχει*, I refer him to Sam. Petit's *Miscellan.* observat. l. 1. c. 2. p. 9, 10. [Ibid.]

W. And I refer him to Richardus Bentley, in not. ad *Fragmenta Callim.* num. 86. p. 340. For, Sir, do you think your so often saying, I refer the reader to, &c. will pass any where, but among yourselves, for a confutation of Dr. Bentley? Though this Sam. Petit being a

critick from whom as little is to be learn'd, as from any of those whose books have the good luck to bear a price, I am apt to believe you may have read him.

V. Callimachus may have written a Tragedy called Daedalus, of which Tragedy, this fragment, (n. 305.) may have been part. [P. 65, 66.]

W. No, Sir, that cannot be. But that you were resolved to be an author, you might, perhaps, have pass'd for a scholar. This fragment is part of an hexameter, a sort of metre which a very moderate antiquarian would have told you the ancients never made use of in Tragedy.

Ἐν δὲ λάχσοις μὲν ἔργα σιδίρου.

V. The Dr. n. 139. cites among the Fragmenta incerti loci, [P. 67.] that known passage out of Athenagoras, *Κρῆτες δὲ ψευσταὶ, &c.* which verses are no fragment, but part of that entire poem, Hymnus in Jovem.

W. This looks like cavilling. Athenagoras his Reflection upon Callimachus is not so vulgarly known, and for the sake of that alone did the Dr. I presume, produce this passage, *πιστεύων Καλλιμαχε ταῖς γοραῖς, &c.*

Besides these learned observations of your own, and your many judicious animadversions upon the mistakes of the Dr. you have been pleased to present the learned world with some farther discoveries by way of Supplement to the former editions of Callimachus. After my having been at such pains to disclose some of your failures, 'twere injustice to conceal your improvements. But before I come to them, there is another part of your charge against the Dr. not immediately concerning Mr. Stanley's MS. upon which I am obliged to bestow some few reflections.

Not content to have made the Dr. so notorious a plagiary upon the account of Mr. Stanley's MS. you intermix here and there some proofs of plagiarism upon him from some other printed books. 'Tis resolved, I see, the Dr. shall be a plagiary. The work is begun and it must be finished. [Mr. B. p. 143, 171, 183, and 54, 138, 216, 226, 233, 248, 261, 262, &c. Vid. et Dr. B.'s Ausw. p. 213, 333, 383, &c.] If any of the same passages be to be found in any other books whatsoever, whether printed or MS. as in the Dr. from thence shall the Dr. have stole them. According to which method I challenge you, Sir, to name that modern writer, writing upon a subject wherein the producing the authorities of the ancients is necessary, whom I shall not (even without the assistance of a club, and with no more than one set of fingers to turn over books) prove a plagiary. And yet this is the way of these gentlemen's (I'll venture to put it in the plural number) managing their controversie with Dr. Bentley. But as for you your self, sir, (such is your reading) you are very sparing of your instances of this kind; and in these few you do produce as obliging to the Dr. as heart could wish.

I took notice [supr.] of about 9 or 10 pages in Dr. Bentley's collection, small letter and close print, sc. from p. 327. to p.

337. for which only a little marginal reference in Mr. Stanley; the consideration of which I then postponed, and shall here take it up. It is indeed at first sight the most plausible thing against the Dr. in the whole indictment, and seems to make him directly beholden to Mr. Stanley for a little hint at least, though the working it out was left to himself. Were I at a loss for an answer here, our Vindicator (which, I thank him, he seldom fails to do) hath supply'd me with one. [P. 54, 55.] But I need not crave his assistance. The case is this.

In Mr. Stanley's MS. over-against the title Θαυματῶν, in the margin, stands, Meurs, in Antig. c. CXLIV. That chapter in Antigonus begins thus. Ήπειρίηται δέ τινα καὶ ὁ κύνηρος Καλλιμάχος ἐκλογὴν τῶν παραδόξων ἡς ἀναγράφομεν, ἢ ποτε ἡμῖν ἔρανετο εἶναι ἄκοης ἄξια; i. e. Callimachus of Cyrene hath made a collection of things strange and wonderfull, the most remarkable of which I shall transcribe. And so he begins his transcribing, Φησὶν Εὔδοξος ἴστροιν ὅτι, &c. He (Callimachus) saith, that Eudoxus relates that, &c.

Now upon this Mr. Stanley had made this remark. Quibus ex verbis omnia quae sequuntur usque ad finem libri ex Callimacho de-prompta esse conjectere licet; i. e. From which words one may conjecture that all that follows in Antigonus to the end of the book is taken from Callimachus. And good reason had he so to conjecture; for Antigonus in his cap. 144. entering upon transcribing from Callimachus, and it not appearing (his book being imperfect) where he ended, the inference is very fair, that all that follows in that book, as it now stands imperfect, is taken from Callimachus. An instance of the same kind we have before in the same book. Antig. c. 32. Καὶ μὴν τὰς τε λοιπὰς ἐντρεχεῖς τῶν Σών —ἀκριβέστατ' ἂν τις ἐκ τῆς τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους συναγωγῆς καταμάθοι. Εἰς ἡς ἡμεῖς πρῶτον ποιησόμεθα τὴν ἐκλογὴν, cap. 33, φησὶ περὶ κωνώπ. &c. i. e. 'The several other wonderfull sagacities of certain animals one may find most accurately described in the writings of Aristotle, out of which, before I go any further, I shall make this following collection. cap. 33. He saith that the wolves about the Lake of, &c.' And so he goes on still transcribing out of Aristotle to cap. 127. which he thus concludes, Πολλῶν δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀν καταγέγραφεν Ἀριστοτέλης, &c. i. e. 'But Aristotle hath left behind him many books, out of which what I have here given is all that I could at present recollect.' And so he breaks off his transcribing out of Aristotle. After the same manner doth he begin his collection out of Callimachus, c. 144. But where he ended, his book being imperfect, we know not. Therefore saith Dr. Bentley, p. 328. et profectò ut omnia, quæ deinceps, &c. 'As all that is in Antigonus from cap. 32. to cap. 127. is transcribed from Aristotle, so all from cap. 144. to the end of, the book is taken from Callimachus.' And accordingly all those passages he transfers into his collection. Upon which our Vindicator cries out shame upon him. 'I cannot acquit hym,' saith he, 'either of being vain-glorious, or a plagiary, when he avers (as 'tis true he doth) that he himself was the first who restored those noble fragments to their true author.' For how can Dr. Bentley have

the face to say, that he was the first, when Mr. Stanley had observed it before him. But had Mr. Stanley also observed the like of Aristotle? But to let that drop. Pray, sir, will you please to read your own words immediately following your transcription out of Mr. Stanley. *Quibus ex verbis, &c.* And with Mr. Stanley agrees the learned Johnsius in his second book of the Writers of Philosophick History, cap. 12. p. 176. [P. 55.] If therefore Johnsius had observed it as well as Mr. Stanley, then Mr. Stanley was neither the first man nor the only man that had observed it. And why may not our learned critick (a title, which, since some books lately publish'd against him, no man will deny to Dr. Bentley) have observed it without the help of Mr. Stanley's MS. [P. 61.] as well as had the learned Johnsius, whose right to the same title is as little disputed? But in the words immediately following, [P. 55.] and in several other places of your book, you tell us over and over, and that very emphatically, that the Dr. had thorowly read that piece of Johnsius. [P. 61. et seqq. Mr. B; p. 142.] You have over-done your work, sir, and laid the indictment in two places. The unhappiest man at managing an accusation, that ever took such a piece of work in hand. Pray, sir, will you please to certifie the world in your third edition, from whom did the Dr. take this hint first? Did he take it from Johnsius first, and afterwards from Mr. Stanley? or first from Mr. Stanley, and afterward from Johnsius? This, sir, is a point upon which you ought to be very determinate, [P. 76.] the province you have taken upon you obligeth you to restore every paragraph to its right author. And therefore you must let the world know precisely, if Dr. Bentley's name must be expunged, whose name must be put in the room of it in the next impression of Callimachus: [P. 74.] whether Mr. Stanley's or the learned Johnsius. For without a more particular information than you have yet given, Mr. Gravius will not be able to do justice between them.

But I'll maintain the Dr.'s right. His name must not be expunged out of the next impression. I very confidently presume the discovery was of the Dr.'s own making, and (not to flatter him) 'tis one of the meanest in his whole book. Antigonus himself had laid it so full in view, that no body, reading him with attention, especially having that Greek poet, Callimachus, in his thoughts, could have pass'd it over unobserved. Let the reader cast his eyes back upon the *πεποίηται δέ τινα* — and the *φησίν*. Callimachus made a certain collection—he saith that—now, sir, dip upon what chapter you will in Antigonus after c. 141. to the end of his book, (abating here and there an intersertion of the collector's own, easie enough to be distinguish'd from the rest) you will find this *φησίν* either express or subintellect before the infinitive mood: for the Dr.'s correction of *Θεόθριστος* into *Θεόφραστον*, c. 145. and of *ἰστορεῖ* into *ἰστορεῖν*, c. 147. with others of the like kind, I suppose no body (unless perhaps your self) will dispute with him: And that *φησίν* must have some Nominative Case, and that Nominative Case can be up other than *Καλλιμάχος*. So that the utmost of the Dr.'s discovery here was only finding out first the principal verb, and the then Nomi-

native Case to it : which 'tis a strange thing if he could not have done without the help of your MS.

But 'why then is the Dr. so vain glorious upon his performance here if it was so easie a thing ? [P. 54.] Haud malè, opinor, de Callimacho meritus sum, qui primus tām luculenta ἀποσπασμάτια illi restituo. 'I think Callimachus is not a little obliged to me for being the first who restore to him so fair a quantity of fragments.'

Because the thing is true. For how obvious soever the discovery might lie, yet no body having before given the publick any notice of it, (no not, in express terms, Johnsius hims self) or taken care to restore these fragments to their true author : to the Dr. alone doth Callimachus owe his obligations. Besides which, Callimachus is not a little obliged to the Dr. for the commendable pains you your self acknowledge him to have bestow'd upon these fragments ; [Ibid.] for his having restor'd them to their genuine Lection, and for his having justified our poet's narrations from the concurring testimonies of so many other good authorities. And if you will please to look over the many improvements which (after the learned and accurate Meursius and Xylander) the Dr. hath made upon that part of Antigonus, you will find that he might well think Callimachus not a little obliged to him, and that I speake within compass when I said before, [Supr.] bringing this very instance for a proof of it, that in many places for one single line which you alledge against the Dr. as stolen from Mr. Stanley, the Dr.'s additions are more than twenty to one. As in this present case is very manifest, taking in your marginal reference in its utmost extent.

Ay, that's true indeed, in this place. But to whom is the Dr. obliged for all this ? To the learned Johnsius, who advised his reader to consult Stephanus, Pliny, and Suidas. [P. 55.] And 'tis plain by the comparison, that Dr. Bentley followed his advice, though he will not own his kindness.

As much as to say ; that Dr. Bentley would never have read Stephanus, Pliny, and Suidas, had not the learned Johnsius put him in mind of it, that there were such books in the world, and that he ought to read them. For this advice and advertisement is it that the Dr. is so deeply obliged to the learned Johnsius, and (ungratefull man as he is) hath not told the world who told him of those books.

'Tis plain, by the comparison, you say, that the Dr. follow'd his advice. That is, to a man that will read over the Dr.'s Collection it will plainly appear, that the Dr. hath read Stephanus, Suidas and Pliny. As for Stephanus and Suidas we have had enough of them already. [Supr.] But hath the Dr. read Pliny too ? Yes, 'tis plain, you say, he hath. Now, pray, sir, turn to the 83d page of your book, and there you do as good as say the Dr. hath not read Pliny. For the Dr. having produced several passages out of Pliny, as n. 392, 393, 394, &c. Harduin's Indices, say you, directed Dr. Bentley to these quotations out of Pliny, q. d. Dr. Bentley did not meet with these quotations in Pliny himself, but just turned to the Index

Authorum, v. Callimachus, and so came by them. But if the Dr. follow'd Johnsius's advice, and turned over Pliny himself, as 'tis plain he did; what need was there of running to Harduin's Indices? 'Tis a plain case, sir, from the beginning of your book to the end of it; that you know not, or matter not what you say, so that you can but fling out somewhat against the Dr. And this is the way of all of you. Calumnoare fortiter, is the rule you go by. But there should be a little wit in it. I wonder how your book comes to bear a second edition. In p. 65. I find you upon Harduin and Pliny again. His quotation out of the Scholiast upon Apollonius Harduin in his notes upon Pliny supply'd him with. Ridiculous! as if the Scholiast upon Apollonius himself were not sooner read over than a Pliny with Harduin's notes, or as if that were the only quotation out of the Scholiast upon Apollonius in the Dr.'s collection. [Vid. supr.] But that quotation is not in Harduin's Index. So that all that is in Harduin's Index, from the Index the Dr. stole it: but what is not in the Index, for that he is oblig'd to Johnsius, who advis'd him to read over Pliny himself, which advice, 'tis plain, the Dr. followed. Are you not ashamed, sir, of putting such stuff as this into print? I do not answer these things, as if they deserved an answer, but to let the world see how these men manage their controversie against Dr. Bentley. The Dr. must have what is in the Index, or not have what is in the author, vid. supr.

But you are a person as unlucky in your memorandums, as you are inconsistent in your allegations. Let me lay down this as a rule: 'tis not for a young writer to despise an Index. 'Tis but comparing the author of Dr. Bentley's Dissertation upon the Epistles of Phalaris examined, p. 164. with Dr. Bentley's answer, p. 229. And with the Index to a very common book, Ålian. Var. Hist. literâ x. and you'll find out my meaning.

V. The quotation out of the learned Scholiast upon Aristophanes, n. 101. was ready brought to his hands by the editor of Aristænetus his Epistles, ep. 10. p. 229. [P. 57.]

W. I had reason to observe of you, that you are the most unhappy man to your friends, and the most obliging to your adversary that ever took pen in hand.

The Dr. stole his quotation out of the Scholiast upon Aristophanes from the editor of Aristænetus his Epistles.

Answ. 1. Compare your learned patron, p. 31. Marg. with Dr. B. Answer, p. 21. and Mr. B.'s p. 164. again with Dr. B.'s answer, p. 229, 230. and you will find that the Dr. was too well acquainted with the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, to have borrowed his quotation out of that Scholiast from the editor of Aristænetus.

2. The Dr. in this very place rectifies a mistake of that learned Scholiast, which the learned editor of Aristænetus transcribes into his annotations without taking any notice of it. So that you have here marked out an instance for the reader to reflect upon: that the Dr. how notorious a plagiary soever, yet he is none of your pedanious criticks, a literatin transcriber of other men's mistakes, and making them

his own. The Dr. is able to correct the faulty opinions of the Ancients, as well as the faulty copies of their works.

3. The Dr. also rectifies a little mistake of that learned editor of Aristænetus (Josias Mererius, sir, the father-in-law to Salmasius) who misquotes this piece of Callimachus under the title of Acontius, whereas it should have been Κιδίπτη; as the Dr. from the authority of Ovid establishes it. And that I put the reader in mind of this other second little advantage, which (as to this particular) Dr. Bentley hath over the learned Mererius, is owing to your self, who were so friendly to the Dr. as to point it out to me.

4. You have supply'd the Dr. with a fresh authority here for that new Lection which he gives of this fragment, and justified his correction of the learned Scholiast upon Aristophanes. The fragment itself is this.

Ἄλλ' ἐν δὴ φλοιοῖσι κεκομιμένα τίσσα φορεῖτε
Γράμματα, Κιδίπτη δόσσ' ἐρέοντο καλήγε.

In the Scholiast upon Aristophanes, for φλοιοῖσι it stands φύλλοισι: and as that Lection is admitted by him for genuine; so from him in the same words is it transcribed by the learned Mererius: and otherwise than with that Lection I presume it is no where to be found, nor was there ever, perhaps, before the Dr. any suspicion entertained concerning it. But the Dr. than whom (tis plain by the comparison) no man reads books more intently, discovered something of incongruity in this Lection φύλλοισι, and therefore ventures, by a conjectural emendation, to restore it φλοιοῖσι. And was at some pains to justifie the correction both from reason and authority; but the most proper authority in the world to his purpose he had (I know not how) omitted. In comes our most obliging Vindicator here, and supplies him with it. Nor could one, that had studied for it, have given a fuller demonstration of the Dr.'s happiness at a conjecture, than hath this very man, who is writing a book against him; having pointed out to us the very place which establishes beyond controul ev'ry thing the Dr. hath said, Aristænet. ep. 10. (m. p. 46, 49.) εἴθε ὁ δευτέρα, &c. η γοῦν τοσαῦτα κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν ἔγεγολαμμένα φέροντε γράμματα δόσα τὴν Κιδίπτην πονομάζει καλήγε, n. b. κατὰ τῶν φλοιῶν, not φύλλων; words coming as near to those of the fragment according to the Dr.'s correction of it, as prose and verse would fairly admit. Sir, the Dr. is obliged to you, and (in his name) I presume to return you thanks. This discovery (the very best in your whole book, though made without your knowing any thing of it) will, I doubt not, be inserted in the next impression of Callimachus. And therefore,

5. From hence I infer a negative directly contradictory to your affirmative, viz. The Dr. did not take his quotation out of the Scholiast upon Aristophanes from the editor of Aristænetus. For if the Dr. had then had Aristænetus in his view, he would not have omitted an authority so direct to his purpose. You may cavil; but the inference is undeniable.

I have drawn out my answer to this your allegation into so many

particulars, to shew you, first, How imprudently you have acted in putting one so often in mind of things which were better forgotten : though indeed let the best pen that can be found engage any farther in this cause, it will be next to impossible to escape splitting upon the same rock. And secondly, to let you see how much it turns to the Dr.'s advantage to have his writings brought under a close examination.

V. The greatest and best part of those numerous quotations which adorn Dr. Bentley's edition under the several *Hilaries*, p. 351, et seq. were before collected by Johnsius. [P. 61.]

W. At which least the reader should be surprized, you spend no less than three pages to shew with what judgment and accuracy that learned person hath treated of these catalogues, indices, or tables of Callimachus. [Ibid.] So that all that you prove here is, that he must be a very extraordinary man indeed, who can so exhaust his subject as that Dr. Bentley coming after him shall not find room for improvements. And if you could have said not only the greatest and best part, but all and every one of the quotations in the Dr.'s collection were before drawn together by Johnsius, yet even so it would have amounted to no more than this : that two very learned persons treating upon the same point of antiquity, neither of them had made any material omissions. If you had known how to have managed your cause, you should have spared your elaborate elogies upon Johnsius, [P. 55, 61, &c.] with which you have but made a garland for Dr. Bentley. Like the monarch, who spent the greatest part of a long reign in gathering trophies onely to place them all at last upon his neighbour's head.

But you will not part with Johnsius so. If you can have read me hitherto without a blush, prepare for one now.

V. Dr. Bentley to conceal his transferring Johnsius's correction of Antimachus for Callimachus into his own stores, [P. 64.] cites the passage (n. 390.) out of Eusebius, whereas in the edition of Tatianus, from whom Eusebius had it, the names are as they ought to be read.

W. Good reader, look over these words again ; Dr. Bentley to conceal &c. [P. 19, 25, 76.] Here doth this man, who quotes scripture and councils, charge Dr. Bentley with having stole a correction from Johnsius, and with using a certain artifice to conceal the fraud. Every syllable of which is as wilfull a falsehood as words can express. Turn to the Dr.'s n. 390. p. 423. Tatianus apud Eusebium, *Præp. Evang.* lib. 10. Περὶ μὲν γὰρ τῆς Ὁμήρου, &c. After the quotation given at large the Dr. hath these words. Ex hoc loco Vossius in libello posthumo de Poetis laudat Callimachum Colophonium : sed lege apud Eusebium Ἀρίμαχος ὁ Κολοφώνιος. Ut recte habetur apud ipsum Tatianum, sed hoc video doctissimum JOHNSTUM ante me animadvertisse. 'Tis true the Dr. transcribes the passage out of Eusebius, but he tells us how it stands in Tatianus. The reason of his transcribing it out of Eusebius, was, I presume, to take this oppor-

tunity of giving the reader notice of a false Lection crept into the copies of that author, and of a mistake from thence transferred into Vossius his posthumous piece de Poetis. No, saith the Vindicator; he did it on purpose to conceal his having stole this correction from Johnsius. Oh Confidence! Conceive it, sir. Sed hoc video doctissimum JOHNSIUM ante me animadvertisse. To conceal! as plain as pen can put down words on paper, 'tis declar'd that the learned Johnsius had made that correction before him. Here are your writers against Dr. Bentley! And will you still believe them, reader? But take another instance.

V. The corrections of the Fragment, n. 233. [P. 71, 72.] were ready made to the Dr.'s hand by Salmasius, and in Is. Vossius his MS. The old translator of Pollux had given the true rendering of ἐν δὲ Ηλούτῳ. Pluto Aristophanes: which Dr. Bentley calls his own.

W. Confidently! Dr. Bentley doth not call the true rendering ἐν δὲ Ηλούτῳ his own. So far is the Dr. from claiming to himself the corrections ready made to his hands by others, that in express terms he disclaims them. The Dr.'s words are these: Qui quidem locus, in vulgatis codicibus mendosissimus, recte ita emendatus est à viris eruditis. — et ita sane Codex qui fuit Isaaci Vossii. Is this calling things his own? "Were charity to believe you cannot construe Latin. But the rectifying the mistakes of the Scholast, and the correcting the text of Aristophanes himself: a correction just and necessary, and which perhaps was never so much as aimed at before the Dr. and without which, neither could the poet, nor his commentator, nor J. Pollux have been understood; this the Dr. doth call his own, and his own it is, vid. loc. Fragm. n. 233. p. 595.

V. Salvagnius Boessius in his Prolegomena to his commentary upon Ovid's Ibis, [P. 85.] hath inserted the epigram out of the Anthology (which Dr. Bentley has transcribed num. 2.) with the emendation of Καλλίμαχος for Καλλιμάχων (claimed as his own by the Dr.) though he confesses that the admirable critick Eustathius reads it Καλλιμάχου.

W. Of all this I do not understand one word. The emendation of Καλλιμάχου into Καλλίμαχος, the Dr. doth both here Fragm. n. 2, and Ep. ad fin. Malel. p. 71. claim as his own, and his own I believe it is. In Salvagnius Boessius's Prolegomena I find not a syllable of that epigram either with an emendation or without. Who confesses, that the admirable critick Eustathius reads it Καλλιμάχος? Salvagnius, or Dr. Bentley? in neither of them do I find the least mention of Eustathius relating to this matter. My Salvagnius Boessius is 8vo. Lugd. 1661. There may be some later edition for ought I know, in which may be the passages you speak of; but I have never seen any such edition, nor (as I have a reason, not worth the telling, to believe) hath Dr. Bentley. So that how many soever editions of Salvagnius Boessius there may be, what Dr. Bentley here calls his own is still his own.

V. In those Prolegomena also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the Alca.

W. In Dacier's *Testimonia veterum* also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the *Aitia*: and in Farnaby's *Martial* also is to be found the epigram of Martial upon the *Aitia*. Stuff!

V. In Salvagnius Boessius his commentary upon Ovid's *Ibis* are many other good observations, which Dr. Bentley hath read.

W. 'Tis more than natural stupidity: it looks like a kind of infatuation, that a man should be so constant in confuting himself. Compare, sir, these two pages of your's: page 35. with page 85.

Page 35. The epigram out of Martial (n. 2.) is in Mr. Stanley's collection.

Page 85. The epigram out of Martial (n. 2.) is in Salvagnius Boessius (in. p. 48.) And Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read.

Page 35. The quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus (n. 2.) is in Mr. Stanley's collection.

Page 85. But Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read: and in Salvagnius Boessius is that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, verbatim, p. 47.

Page 35. The quotation out of Servius upon Virgil, n. 8. [Supr.] is transcribed from Mr. Stanley, verbatim.

Page 85. Salvagnius Boessius his commentary upon Ovid's *Ibis* Dr. Bentley hath read: and in that commentary, p. 301. is that quotation out of Servius upon Virgil.

How will you look your Honourable Patron in the face, after having thus discover'd to him how carelessly you read his book, and how little you minded the caution he gave you, Not to lay your indictment in two places. [Mr. B. p. 142.]

And this is what I before promised you to take some particular notice of. [Supr.] Read what is there written upon that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, Εἰσοριων γὰρ, &c. I here repeat my charge against you, sir, and in the plain unaffected stile I call you false accuser, and prepensely such. You knew these several passages to be in Salvagnius Boessius; Salvagnius Boessius you knew the Dr. to have read: how then durst you charge these particular passages upon him as proofs of his plagiarism from Mr. Stanley's MS. all of which you knew the Dr. to have met with elsewhere; and one of which you knew, you could not but know, your own eye sight assured you, that the Dr. did actually transcribe, not from Mr. Stanley, but from Salvagnius Boessius? I say, which you could not but know, that the Dr. did not take from Mr. Stanley. For that quotation out of Clemens Alexandrinus, as it is given us in the Dr.'s collection, I am very confident is not now (whatsoever it may be e'er long) in Mr. Stanley's MS. nor, I believe in any other printed book whatever save in Salvagnius Boessius: and therefore only from him can the Dr. have transcribed it. And this you cannot have been ignorant of, since both Salvagnius Boessius, and Dr. Bentley himself have given express notice of it: *Salvagnius*, p. 47. *Sic et Clemens Alexandrinus*, lib. 5. *Strom.* Εἰσοριων γὰρ ὁ πονητης, &c. Sic enim Manuscriptus meus pervetustus Codex cum in omnibus Editionibus desint hæc verba καὶ ἡ Καλλιμάχου ΙΒΙΣ; and in Dr. Bentley, p. 343. Tit. ΙΒΙΣ ita

Codex MSus Dionysii Salvagnii: in vulgatis ΙΒΙΣ abest. I do therefore again and again repeat it upon you, sir, though your whole book be a proof of it, yet more especially from this particular passage, as being an irrefragable demonstratiou; that you ate a false accuser, and that you are preposessely such. First, in telling the world, that that is in your MS, which is not in your MS, and secondly, in placing among your proofs of things transcribed from your MS, that which you knew was not transcribed from your MS, and upon both these articles I bring in your own Salvagni's *Essays* as for evidence against you. And this you have gotten by over doing your work, and laying your indictment in two places. And then an once convicted of wilfull, I cannot say perjury, because 'tis not in a Court of Record, though you have kiss'd the Bible upon it more than once; yet of wilfull prevarication is become for ever afterward (at least, as to that cause) an incompetent witness. And how far this sentence may extend, I leave it to those who are most concerned in it to consider: desiring them withdraw, out of pure compassion to themselves, not to be over eager in tempting a no very unwilling man to discover all he knows. For the letting the world know, how far base men are to be credited, I take to be doing a good piece of service to the publick; which he that shall venture upon, as he must incur the displeasure of many, so he deserves the thanks of more than one. I have complied (and not many more so obedient readers can he boast of) with Mr. B.'s unreasonable request, with which he concludes his preface to his examination of Dr. Bentley. But as for you yourself, sir, I have now near upon the matter done with you. For as for your wretched common-place railery, and your blunt characterisms upon the Dr. (most of them stole from your honourable patron, but spoild in the telling) I scorn to take any notice of them. But there is still behind your Supplement.

WALLACE.

A Poem which obtained the Chancellor's Medal at the Cambridge Commencement, July 1815.

"Manns haec iurimica tyrannis
Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem."

ON GAMBIA'S BANKS, no sweetly-breathing gale
Cheers the lone wild or fans the thirsty vale,
In weary silence rolls each livelong day,
And nature pants beneath the sultry ray :
Yet will the negro, from his deserts torn
And far away to western climates borne,

O'er the wide ocean cast a wistful eye,
 And think upon his native sands and sigh—
 Turn we to where the Northern tempest roars,
 To Lapland's drear, inhospitable shores ;
 The breast of Lapland owns no genial glow,
 Pale is her aspect and her mantle snow :
 By Winter withered, shrouded by the storm
 Amid yon arctic rocks she lifts her form,
 While ocean-blasts a deadly chilness shed,
 And meteor phantoms hover round her head.—
 And would you lure the peasant from his home
 Beneath a milder, kinder heaven to roam ;
 Vain were the task—His every thought and care
 Still loves to linger in his native air ;
 The child of woe, by cold and want opprest,
 He boasts a patriot passion in his breast,
 And, happy tenant of an humble sied,
 Smiles at the storm, that howls above his head.

Spirit of generous Pride, whose high command
 Binds all affections to one spot of land ;
 Thou that canst wake a breeze on Afric's shore,
 And bid the Polar blast forget to roar ;
 When, rapt in History's page, the eye surveys
 Deeds of the mighty dead in ancient days,
 Is there a tongue, that honors not thy name ?
 A heart, that burns not with thy kindling flame ?
 Whether, in classic record, it retrace
 Th' expiring efforts of a sinking race,
 And mark the morn, morn dear to Rome and thee,
 When Brutus struck and saw his country free :—
 Or whether later times the tale disclose,
 How Grisler triumphed in a nation's woes,
 Till vengeance bade insulted worth rebel,
 And Freedom smiled upon the sword of Tell : ..
 Or how, unawed amid a cheerless land,
 Brave WALLACE reared on high the patriot brand.

Wallace, undaunted foe to lawless power,
 Friend to thy Scotland in her darkest hour,
 In action daring and in danger proved,
 Famed for thy valor, for thy virtues loved ;
 These were the crimes, that claimed a tyrant's hate,
 And gave thy manhood to an early fate.
 Thee, Wallace, thee thy native woodlands mourned,
 The grots and echoing caves the moan returned ;

The frowning cliff, the torrent, vale and glade
Poured a sad tribute to thy pensive shade,
And every gale that blew from rock and sea,
And every zephyr bore a sigh for thee.
The shout of war, that waked a Southern host,
Was heard no more upon the sullen coast ;
In murmurs floating on the banks of Clyde¹
The last, sweet music of thy bugle died ;
That beacon blaze, which patriot hands had fired,
Glimmered a parting radiance and expired ;
Hushed was each hope, the dream of gladness fled,
And Scotland languished, when her offspring bled.

Heard ye that war-note burst the deep repose ?
It was the knell of Caledonia's woes—
O saw ye not the banner streaming red ?
That banner waves above a tyrant's head—
Proud with the spoils of Cambria's fallen state,
And reeking from the brave Lewellyn's fate,
Edward has summoned all his warrior band
To pour the tide of battle on the land—
Insatiate king, when erst on Holy shore
Thy battle-blade was drenched in Paynim gore,
Full oft the laurel bloomed upon thy brow --
And seek'st thou yet another garland now ?
Lord of a mighty race, a wide domain,
Yet canst thou envy Scotland's rugged reign ?
O sheath thy sword and fling thy buckler by,
Nor smite the mountain haunts of Liberty.
But vain is Reason's voice and weak her sway,
When thirst of endless empire leads the way,
And wild Ambition beckons and invites
To trample on mankind's insulted rights,
To stand, with gory lance and flag unfurled,
High o'er the ruins of a prostrate world.
Then fair Religion seeks her inmost cell,
Indignant Justice bids a long farewell,
And Science breathes a last, a dying moan,
And sorrowing Virtue pines unpitied and unknown.
Cursed be the fatal day, when Edward came
In crested pride to urge a lawless claim ;
Cursed be the day.—Let weeping History tell
How fought the brave and how the noble fell,

¹ Wallace was betrayed into the hands of Edward in the neighbourhood of Glasgow.

When, slowly swelling, rolled the battle tide
 On Falkirk's field of death and Carron's side—
 The beam of morn, that rose on eastern height,
 Danced on the plume of many a gallant knight :
 The ray, that lingered on the ocean-wave,
 Kissed the red turf of many a soldier's grave.
 Dark as the torrent's desolating flow,
 And drear as winter was that time of woe :
 Yet drooped not Hope : she turned her azure eyes
 Where heaven-ward Caledonia's mountains rise,
 And deep embosomed in the gloom of night
 A star was seen to shed a lonely light ;
 It burned afar with lustre pale and sweet
 To mark the spot of Freedom's last retreat.
 There on a rock, unmoved and undismayed,
 The sable plumage waving o'er his head,
 Stern Wallace stood —With high uplifted hand
 He shook the gleamy terrors of his brand,
 Glanced proudly on th' embattled host below,
 And mocked the menace of a conquering foe—
 And long had mocked,—but Heaven untimely frowned,
 And plucked the fairest flower on Scottish ground.
 It was no falchion raised in mortal strife
 That snatched thee, Wallace, from the light of life ;
 No arrow glided on the wings of death
 To drink thy blood and steal away thy breath ;
 Thine were no honors of a glorious grave,
 The patriot's boast, the birthright of the brave ;
 Far other fate thy generous zeal repaid,
 Torn from thy country, by thy friend betrayed.—
 Methinks I see thee led in sullen state,
 High in thy fall, and, e'en in fetters, great,
 And view thee dragged in all the pomp of woe,
 A sport of impotence, a public show.
 Still conscious virtue cheers thy latest hour,
 Nor sinks thy spirit in the grasp of power ;
 Still in the pangs of death thy closing eyes
 Speak the proud thoughts, that in thy bosom rise ;
 And the last sigh, that gave the soul release,
 Breathed to thy Scotland liberty and peace.

O Wallace, if my voice can pierce the gloom
 And rouse the silent slumbers of the tomb,
 O'er thy cold dust the Muse shall pour her strain,
 To tell thee, that thou didst not fall in vain—
 Yes, honored Shade, though brief was thy career,
 And not a stone records thy lowly bier ;

E'en yet, thy native woods and wilds among,
Thy wreaths are verdant and thy deeds are sung.
There haply as some minstrel tells thy tale
To many a mountain chief and listening Gael,
Their kindling bosoms catch the patriot flame,
And learn the path to Freedom and to Fame.

EDWARD SMIRKE, St. John's College.

OBSERVATIONS

On the "REMARKS on Sir W. DRUMMOND's Dissertation on Genesis XLIX," inserted in the Classical Journal, No. XXII.

I HAVE read the Biblical Criticisms in your *Journal* as they have regularly appeared, and I have thought from the beginning, that much good may be done by a cool and dispassionate inquiry after the sense of such passages, as in translations are altogether inconsistent with the justice and mercy of God. Even those, whose province it is to explain the Sacred Scriptures, are frequently at a loss to show that the objectionable passages (which are indeed many) are in any way even compatible with the justice and mercy of man. Much valuable information has been already given ; and if some of your learned correspondents, who seem to have devoted a great part of their lives to the study of the original language, were to continue their labors, much light, no doubt, would be given to those passages, which infidels always adduce in support of their opinions.

I cannot, however, approve the productions of those writers, who not only endeavour to run down others, without referring to scripture proof, but who are in the constant habit of finding fault with every thing advanced by some of your most luminous writers, however strongly supported by evidence. This puts me in mind of a certain gentleman, who, in the House of Commons, declared himself to be such an enemy to the politics of Mr. Pitt, that he was determined to oppose him, right or wrong. I therefore take the liberty to make a few remarks on an article in your last No., p. 305, signed W. A. Hailes ; and leave the judgment of your readers to determine whether he is competent for the

150 *Observations on Sir W. Drummond's*

work he has undertaken : viz. of elucidating the Scripture from the original Hebrew.

In the translation of that memorable passage, Gen. xlix. 24.—

מִידִי אָבִיר יַעֲקֹב כְּשֶׁם רָעוֹת אָכֵן יִשְׂרָאֵל
the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob,
from thence is the Shepherd the stone of Israel—this gentleman, with an astonishing degree of confidence, takes the liberty (like a disciple of Kennicott) of translating it thus, “*BY THE NAME of the shepherd the stone of Israel;*” and he says, in answer to Sir Wm. Drummond, “Can Sir William object to this version of the unpointed Hebrew? Is there any thing, then, in the passage to embarrass a person searching for truth?”

It does not behove me to show that the general tenor of the prophecies, contained in this most important chapter, has been mistaken by translators and commentators, but I will show that this writer is decidedly wrong in his Hebrew criticism.

The word מִשְׁאָם, *mishaam*, is never, in any part of the Sacred Scripture, translated by “*name:*” it is not a *noun*, as Mr. H. has supposed, but an *adverb*; and with the preposition וּ, *mem*, it literally means *from thence*, as it is rightly rendered in the common version, and as may be seen in every part of Scripture where it occurs—Gen. ii. 10; 1 Sam. iv. 4; 1 Kings ix. 28; 2 Kings xxiii. 12; Hos. ii. 15; 1 Chron. xiii. 6; Gen. xi. 8; xii. 8; and xviii. 16, 22; Lev. ii. 2.

The word which means a name, in every part of Scripture, too numerous to be introduced here, is שֵׁם, *sheem*; Gen. ii. 11, and iii. 20, &c. Now, Sir, in disquisitions so serious as these respecting the sacred Scriptures, I would recommend Mr. H. to attend strictly to his Hebrew; he then may help to pull down the strong holds of Satan.

Hitherto I have answered Mr. H. as though this translation had been his own, as he has purported it to be, by not acknowledging מִשְׁאָם *from whence* he has taken it. But what will the learned and the unlearned say, when I prove that he has taken it from a book now before the public, without acknowledging the source of his information. If, however, the reader will refer to a book entitled, “*Commentaries and Essays, by a Society for promoting the knowledge of the Scriptures,*” vol. I. p. 283, an avowed publication of the Essex-street Socinians; he will find that Mr. H. has taken it from that publication, or from the Note on this verse in Pearson and Rollaston’s Bible, edition 1788. I shall show, however, that this translation does no more cre-

dit to the Essex-street gentlemen, as possessing a knowledge of Hebrew, than it does to Mr. H. as the copier.

Before determining the true reading, I will remark on the absurdity of thus translating the passage. We are here first told, that *the arms of his hands were made strong by the hands of the mighty God of Jacob*; but there was no necessity to say, as Mr. H. does, that *the arms of his hands were also made strong by the name of the shepherd the stone of Israel*. To be made strong by the hands, and to be made strong by the name, would be a tautology highly condemnable. “*The arms of his hands were made strong!*” to a certainty יָדֵי יְהוָה, can have no such rendering: it is not sense. It is a very easy matter to quote from the Septuagint, Vulgate, Tremellius, Castellio, Geneva French; to talk of the Samaritan, the Syriac, the Talmuds, &c. and thus make a pompous display of something in imitation of learning and deep research, as this writer attempts to do; but these are only translations, and not authorities; and Mr. H. has been rightly told by Mr. Collit, in your last Number, p. 275, “If names are to be taken for authorities, there is no falsehood, either in physics or morality, which may not be proved to be true.”

I believe it is allowed, that Sir Wm. D. as an oriental scholar, can be equalled by very few; the opportunities he had of improving these important branches of learning, when he was ambassador at the Porte, particularly his acquisition of the Arabic language, seldom fall to the lot of a literary man. Let his *Essay on the Punic Inscription* be read by any person capable of reading it; and it will sufficiently establish his character as an oriental scholar. Should such a scholar be lightly attacked by a person whose critical knowledge of Hebrew does not enable him to distinguish an *adverb* from a *noun* in that language? Had he understood the language he would not so implicitly have adopted the suggestion of those who have shown themselves as ignorant as himself. They have however a claim to originality: nor can they be charged with copying the *discoveries*, without acknowledgment.

One might reasonably conclude, from such an exhibition, that Mr. H. had it in his power to reconcile the numerous passages in the translations which stand opposed to each other; and I could wish to see him attempt something of the kind, instead of indiscriminate censure. No article ought to be admitted on these subjects, unless it contains an elucidation of some controverted part of scripture, confirmed, not by opinion, but by other parts of scripture, where the same word can have no other meaning nor application. And, in conformity with this plan, I shall endeavour to give a true and rational translation of this passage.

Surely Mr. H. has fallen into as great an error here as when he mistook the city גִּבְעָה, *Gibeuh*, for ‘a hill.’ Thus we find what errors are committed by those who contend for the “unpointed Hebrew.” It is a species of perversion of scripture, and is as pernicious in its effects, as to contend against the integrity of the Hebrew text. Remarks of this nature will be published as manifestoes by infidels. But the enmity to the Hebrew arises from this cause: Hebrew is not considered as necessary for admission to the pulpit; therefore many have not acquired a knowledge of it in their younger season of life: it is not taught in our public schools, and after that period they conclude it too late to undertake the arduous task of acquiring a grammatical and critical knowledge of this gigantic language; rendered much more so, by the frightful appearance of *thirteen vowels*, called by these writers, *points*, not to mention the *accents*.

The only proof that can be admitted of any person’s having acquired a knowledge of the Hebrew is, when we find him capable of reconciling those passages in the translation, which have aided the cause of deism, and which are altogether inconsistent with common sense, agreeably to which they were originally written. I have known those who scarcely knew the alphabet of the language, and others who were not able to point out the radical from the scivile letters, attempt to determine on the merit of an article in Hebrew. Surely not only Sir W. D. but every Hebrew scholar, will object to this, and to every version of the “unpointed Hebrew.” Enough perhaps has been said in two articles, in No. XVI. and No. XVII. to show, that without the vowels, not a single word can possibly be pronounced—that, as in all other languages, so in Hebrew, they determine the true meaning and application, as is obvious in the passage before us, that they were co-eval with, and that they form a part of, the language.

Mr. H. in answer to an article in No. X. p. 250. (where it is proved that the word אלהים, *Elohim*, is a noun singular, and that it was so understood by the most learned Jewish writers, when the language was a living language, Jonathan, who expounds the passage, 1 Sam xxviii. 18. ‘אֱלֹהִים רָאָתִי אֶלְךָ’ *I have seen an angel of the Lord ascending;*) and afterwards the learned Kimchi, who expounds Elohim by, a *great man*,) says: “but I take neither of them as authority, since they do not give the literal reading, but what they conceived to be the intended meaning of the text.” A more futile reason was never given: I have shown that these great authorities understood Elohim to be a *noun singular*—and Mr. H. says, “he takes nei-

ther of them as authority, as they give only what they conceived to be the intended meaning of the text." Mr. H. further observes, "we have a specimen of Mr. B.'s modesty, in charging Dr. Kennicott, and De Rossi, with ignorance of the Hebrew, and with adding to and taking from the Hebrew text." After what has been advanced on this subject by your correspondent Mr. Collit, your readers will be at no loss to determine to whom the word *modesty* is applicable. I have made good the well-founded charge, and Mr. H. has convicted himself, by enabling us to determine that, in the case before us, he does not know the difference between a *noun*, and an *adverb* in Hebrew.

It certainly would have been more satisfactory if Mr. H. had endeavoured to give a rational translation of objectionable passages, which, in their present state, are marshalled against the scriptures, for the support of infidelity.

I will give him a short list of passages for his consideration, which will be easily rectified by him, as well as a thousand beside, if he be a sound Hebrew scholar.

Numb. xix. 13. '*Whosoever toucheth the dead body of any man that is dead.*' Gen. xxxvii. 24. '*And the pit was empty, there was no water in it.*' v. 18. '*And when they saw him afar off, even before he came near unto them.*' 23. '*They stript Joseph out of his coat, which was on him.*' Numb. xxii. 31. '*And he fell flat on his face.*' Psal. xxxix. 3. '*Then I spake with my tongue.*' xliv. 12. '*Thou sellest thy people for nought, and dost not increase thy wealth by their price.*' Dan. vi. 8. '*Kneeled upon his knees.*' iii. 6. '*Burning fiery furnace.*' Gen. xxiv. 26. '*Bowed down his head.*' xxvii. 14. '*And fetched, and brought.*' 1 Chron. xix. 4. '*Their buttocks.*' Lev. v. 8. '*divide it asunder.*' Isa. xxxvi. 12. '*eat their own dung.*' 1 Sam. xxv. 12. '*pisseth against the wall.*' Psal. lxxiii. 27. '*that go a whoring.*' Jer. xxxi. 22. '*A woman shall compass a man.*' Respecting this last passage, the truly learned and modest Taylor says, 'I am not able to determine it'—perhaps Mr. H. will favor us with a translation of it. Gen. xlili. 28. '*Thy servant our father is in good health, he is yet alive.*' Isa. xxviii. 13. '*But the word of the Lord was unto them, precept upon precept, precept upon precept, line upon line, line upon line, here a little and there a little, that they might go, and fall backward, and be broken, and snared, and taken.*' Chap. viii. 14, 15. '*And he shall be—for a gin, and for a snare, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem,—And many among them shall stumble and fall, and be broken, and be snared, and be taken.*' Jer. iv. 10. '*Ah, Lord God, thou hast greatly deceived this people, and Jerusalem.*' ch. xx. 7. '*O Lord, thou hast deceived me, and I was deceived.*'

The arms of his hands were made strong : The translators have rendered the word יָדָיו yaadaayo, ‘by his hands,’ and מִדְכָּא midec, ‘by the hands.’ hence arises the improper reading, viz. *the arms of his hands were made strong.* But by the accentual reading we find, that in this passage, the word should be translated by its primary meaning, which is, *power*: see Job. i. 12—Dan. xii. 7. 2 Chron. xxi. 8. And in a secondary sense it signifies the *hand*, having power. The limit of this article will not allow me to explain the construction by the accents here, that will appear in its proper place; the present will be satisfactory, as I have referred to those places, where the word must necessarily have this reading. The two propositions then will have a sense which can be understood, agreeably to the original, and which will read thus: **THE ARMS OF HIS POWER WERE STRENGTHENED; BY THE POWER OF THE MIGHTY ONE OF JACOB, FROM THENCE IS THE SHEPHERD THE STONE OF ISRAEL**, viz. The Messiah.

Where now is the propriety of asking the following question? “Can Sir W. object to this version of the unpointed Hebrew?” I dare say that Sir W., or any other person understanding Hebrew, will object to any translation, where the translator introduces a word, or a letter, which is not in the original, when there is no necessity for it. Mr. H. has no authority for putting the article *the* in the body of the word, *by THE name*. This, truly, is following the plan of Kennicott, and other modellers of the Hebrew Bible, who have endeavoured to put in *letters, words, and even sentences*, to make that plain which is sufficiently evident.—His remarks respecting the word *Elohim*, as used in the narrative of the woman of Endor, have been so fully settled in the former numbers of your *Journal*, that I, as one of your readers, expect a recantation on the part of Mr. H. It will not be the first time that he has acknowledged his errors, nor will it be to his discredit. I agree with him in his judicious remark, No. XIII. p. 62. “There is an idiosyncrasy in some men for interpreting, which is almost totally wanting in others, and which cannot be supplied by all the grammatical knowledge in the world.” I could wish to see this verified in the passages to which I have referred.

It appears that Sir W. D. objects to the present translation of Exod. vi. 3. *but by my name Jehovah, was I not known to them.* And certainly, if taken according to the common acceptation of words, it is objectionable; because it leaves us to suppose that God was not known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, *by the name Jehovah.* He who is the object of these observations says,

" How should a person "who searches the Bible, as he would an astrological calendar, elicit any meaning from it, respecting devotedness to God ?" Sir W. D. supposes that allusions to the science of astronomy are made in the Bible. I have nothing to do with the squabbles of Mr. H. with Sir W.: but I am of opinion that the sacred scriptures cannot be deteriorated by showing that they contain allusions to the science of astronomy, on the basis of true theology ? Is not this calculated to show that they are of more consequence than many have supposed them to be ? Did not that eminent oriental scholar, Sir W. Jones, declare, that he verily believed they contained allusions to all the liberal sciences ? What will your correspondent say, if our best anatomists should ere long allow themselves to be indebted to the Bible for information respecting the science of anatomy, which, with all their labors, they have not yet fully obtained ?

Mr. H. however, in order to remove this apparent objection in the common version, has recourse to the old method of answering all objections ; for he says, " in my opinion נָלַךְ, *lo*, is a corruption." Had Mr. Hailes been able to read the Hebrew Bible agreeably to the grammar of the language, with its vowels and accents, he would have known that the word נָלַךְ, *lo*, is as necessary to a true understanding of the passage, as any word in the verse. I will not use such gross and unchristian-like language to this gentleman on his pretensions to Hebrew criticism, as he has to Sir W. Drummond, though, in the case before us, he does not know an *adverb* from a *noun*; but he must permit me to tell him, what every reader of this article will admit, that, notwithstanding his great anxiety for the reputation of a Hebrew scholar—notwithstanding his consulting the Rabbinical writers : it does not appear that he can read many passages. This Rabbinical reader has informed us, No. XIII. p. 71. that Onkelos has rendered מלְאָךְ יְהוָה *malaak Jchovah.* i. e. 'angel of Jehovah,' by דְּבָרֶךָ *yikra dii*, i. e. 'glory of Jehovah ;' but after having been detected by your learned correspondent *O*, he then tells us, No. XXII. p. 317, that " during the time that the book of Onkelos was in my possession, I made several extracts from it, but I do not find that any of them authorise me to say your correspondent *O* is wrong in his statement. I do not intend to say that I have not mistaken the point mentioned above." I give him credit for this candid acknowledgement, but I appeal to every reader of the *Journal*, whether any dependence can be placed in future on the Hebrew criticisms of this writer, until he has made himself more perfect in the language. But Mr. H. says, " I have been accustomed to read sober critics—Lowth, Leusden ;" &c. but even

Lowth, as I have shown in your former *Journals*, has mistaken the parts of speech in Hebrew.

Mr. H. says, that "Sir W. is not quite correct in stating, Mr. H. proposes to leave out the negative הַלּוּ." "I have said," he observes, "that in my opinion it is a corruption, but I made no proposal to leave it out of the passage." Surely, if it be a corruption, it amounts to a rejection of the word. But this writer, I see, when it suits his purpose, can allow אֱלֹהִים Elohim, to be singular. No. XXII. p. 317; for he says, "whether the person who appeared is (be) called יהוה, or אלהים or מלאך יהוה, one and the same being is to be understood;" viz. no two Jehovahs, no two Elohims; and when it suits him, he can contend that it is a plural noun. p. 277.

I shall say no more of his Hebrew criticism. We have seen his errors to be too gross to admit such a claim: nor shall I in future trouble him, unless he attends to the grammar of the language, in which he is evidently defective.—And when he has so qualified himself, I would also recommend him to write in a different spirit. It is nothing but affectation to talk of "devotedness to God," if he thus writes in the spirit of persecution. Civility is as cheap as abuse: *a soft word turneth away wrath, the heart of the prudent getteth knowledge, and the ear of the wise seeketh knowledge.*

Should Mr. H. attempt to convince your readers of his knowledge of Hebrew, by recovering any of the foregoing passages from their present obscurity, contradiction, and barbarism of language, I would beg of him to remember, that though it may be satisfactory to him when pressed with a difficulty, others will never subscribe to his dogma, that, "it may be, that divine wisdom has ordered difficulties to remain (in the bible) that such men (as he is pleased to call infidels) may be snared, and fall by their own inventions." No. X. p. 248. Mr. H. may rest assured that such writing "will have no tendency to prevent the cavils of infidels." He has said, "if my knowledge of Hebrew extended no farther than Mr. Bellamy's, I would not have had the temerity to trouble the editor with any of my remarks." (No. XVIII. p. 250.): that he has "been somewhat accustomed to mathematical deduction," (very necessary perhaps to a right understanding of Hebrew) that, "on subjects of theology, the Bible is his elementary treatise, in it are contained all his axioms, postulates, and definitions, by the aid of which he must try every question." (No. XIII. p. 82.) Now, Sir, from such a stock, he should be able to show satisfactorily how persons, "ensnared by difficulties ordained by divine wisdom, for the very purpose, can be said to fall by their own inventions?" I have not been able to find such a doc-

trine in the *elementary treatise* to which this writer has referred. Is it really there, or has he formed it himself, in proof of his “devotedness to God?”

With regard to the original, though I have spent above twenty years in acquiring a knowledge of it, I see so much yet to be acquired that I will not call myself a master of the language, or deprecate the meritorious labors of others. I have, however, acquired sufficient knowledge to distinguish an adverb from a noun in Hebrew. For any thing further, I refer to two articles which are before your readers in No. XVI. p. 374—and No. XVII. on the higher branches of the language; and leave it for the reader to determine this matter. I certainly have the highest regard for those who by their labors have been enabled to set controverted parts of Sacred Scripture in their true light, and thus wrest them from the hands of the enemies of revelation. Such labours I conceive to be of the greatest utility to the public, and certainly calculated to maintain the credit of the Classical Journal.

J. BELLAMY.

RICHARDI BENTLEII
Epistolæ Duae
AD
TI. HEMSTERHUSIUM.

ERUDITISSIMO VIRO,
TIB. HEMSTERHUSIO

S. P. D.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS.

DUM mane occupatus eram in scribendis meis ad Horatium annotationibus, et in recensendis foliis, quæ jam tum a typographo accepteram; venerunt ad me gratissimæ tuæ literæ, per Sikium Londino huc missæ; in quibus et eruditio tua singularis eluet cum summa humanitate conjuncta, et egregius erga me amor et voluntas. Quamobrem, ne longiore mora exspectationem tuam mora-

rer, deposito statim Venusino nostro, Pollucem arripui; et quæ de singulis locis mihi sub κρίσιν et conjecturam veniunt, jam hoc ipse die ad te αὐτοσχεῖτέω. Locus primus est IX. 57. ὁ τὸ χρυσὸν στατήρ μνᾶν ἔσθνατο. &c. Nihil hoc falsius dici potest; neque vacat nunc querere, quomodo rem expediant Salmasius, Gronovius, aliquie quos memoras. Certam tibi emendationem præstabo, σταθμὸς pro χρυσόν, ut ex toto loco clare ipse videbis; ὁ δὲ ΣΤΑΘΜΟΣ στατῆρ μνᾶν ἔσθνατο. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοις ιταμενοῖς, τὴν μνᾶν τῆς ροπῆς στατῆρα ὀνομάζουσι καὶ ὅταν εἴποι Ηενταστάτηρον, πεντάμυνον δικοῦσι λέγειν, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ἰπποκράτειος Ηενταστάτηρι. "Οταν γὰρ, τίμαι, λευκὸς ἄνθρωπος, παχὺς, ἀργὺς σκελλαν, εἰσὼς τρυφᾶς, Ηενταστάτηρον, γίγνεται τὸ πνεῦμ' αὐτὸς ἔστι δὲ καὶ ΝΟΜΙΣΜΑ στατῆρ, ὡς ὅταν εἴποι Ἀριστοφάνης, &c. Ex ultimis verbis νίμισμα στατῆρ luce ipsa clarius est, supra non actum esse de Statere Nummo, sed Pondere: neque locum ibi habere γεντιόν (quod de solo nummo dicitur) sed corrigendum σταθμός. Nempe notissimum est, Nummos et pecuniarum summas nomina sua olim a Ponderibus accepisse: inde idem vocabulum et in Ponderibus et in Nummis eundem locum habuit: Postea nummorum singulorum pondere mutato et diminuto, nominibus tamen (a pondere ductis) adhuc servatis, immane quantum discrepabat, de ponderibus, an de nummis loqueretur qui vocabula illa usurparet. Hæc comperta sunt, neque exemplis est opus. Ergo opponuntur hic et Σταθμὸς et νίμισμα; ut paullo ante: Ἡν δὲ καὶ μνᾶ σταθμοῦ τε καὶ νομίσματος ονομα; et saepè alibi tam apud Hunc, quam apud Alios. Στατῆρ igitur, cum de Ponderi dicitur, valebat, ait, μνᾶ minam; hoc est, æquiponderabat minæ: id probat, quia ἐν τοις ιταμενοῖς τὴν μνᾶν τῆς ροπῆς στατῆρα ὀνομάζουσι, hoc est, quia mina ponderis ipso nomine Stater a ponderibus vocaretur. Quippe si idem nomen habeat, habeat utique eundem valorem, ut barbare dicam. Tum aliud profeat argumentum ex Ἰπποκράτειος poëta fabula, qui voce πενταστάτηρος (de pondere) pro πεντάμυνον usus est; ergo stater idem ac Mina. Sed pro Ἰπποκράτειος corrige vel ἱεράτευς (ut alibi Pollux, ubi hunc ipsum locum citat, vel, ut ibi Codex Vossianus, cuius lectiones variantes habeo, Σωσικατου) vel proprius ad vulgatum hic lectionem Ἐπικράτευς, qui passim Athenæo, aliisque laudatur. Sequitur ipse locus ad Iambos a nobis supra redactus; sed versu secundo pro εἰδὼς, lege ἰωδὺς τευτὴ· sententia est, Si quis ex plebe illa urbana, albus et Soli insuetus, pinguis, piger, luxuriæ deditus, vel levissimum ligonem vix quinque librarum pondere sustulit, statim anhelus fit et ilia dicit. ΑΛΩ γίγνεται, ut Horatius noster: SUBLIMI fugies mollis anhelitu, quod Vir magnus, Julius Scaliger, se ex toto Galeno negavit capere posse. Verba jam, opinor, satis illustravimus: rem ipsam, nempe Staterem ἐπὶ στεφανὸν valere Minām, jam confirmatum dabimus. Pollux lib. IV. 173. Σταθμὸν ὀνόματα. ΣΤΑΘΡΑ, ait, οἱ τῆς Κωνιδίας ποιηταὶ τὴν ΛΙΤΡΑΝ λέγουσι. τὰ:

μὲν γορ λίτραν εἰσήκασιν οἱ Σικελοὶ κωμῳδοί. δίκελλαν δὲ πενταστάτηρον Σωτικράτης ἐν Ηρακαταθίκῃ, τὴν πεντάλιτρον. Sic lego ex Codice Vossiano, et est idem locus qui supra ex Hippocrate adductus est. Sententia est, ΑΙΤΡΙΝ, Libram, Siculorum pondus, Poëtæ Comici Athenienses ΣΤΑΤΗΡΑ nominant; et ligonem πεντάλιτρον Sosicrates dixit πενταστάτηρον. Vides hic secundum Pollucem staterem (de pondere dictum) valere libram, λίτραν; in altero loco valere minam, μῖναν. Rectissime: quippe in Ponderibus λίτρα Siculorum idem valebat quod μῖνα Atticorum. Hoc certissimum est; quia utrumque tam *mina*, quam *libra* ducebat olim pondus centum Drachmarum sive Denariorum: ut alia argumenta et exempla taceam. Tu, Vir doctissime, si Anglice scis, de λίτραις et ceteris nummis ponderibusque Siculorum, multa nova reperies in Dissertatione nostra de Epistolis Phalaridis. Jam ad proximum, de quo consulis, locum accedo, qui sic habet IX. 70. Ἐν τοις Ἀγυστοφῶντος Διούμαις ἡ Οὐλαίρω, vel, ut MSS. Διούμαις ἡ Πυρχίδω. quorum utrumque mendosum esse satis constat; quid reponendum sit, cum nusquam alibi citetur hæc fabula, certo scire nefas est. Poteris, Ηὐλαίρω, Junitore; poteris Ηυρείνα sive Ηυρόδαλω, hoc est, χυτόποσι, Batillo; poteris Ηυθαίλη, Pythaula. Sed hoc hariolari est; primum tamen magis arridet. Tertius locus est IX. 93. τησὶ γοῦν ἐν τοῖς Ἀποφθέγμασιν ὁ Καλλιθέης ὅπερ Εύβοιόν του Ἀταρνέτου τὸν ποιητὴν Ηεροῦν ἀμελούμενον, εἰς Μιτυλήνην ἀπελθόντα, θυμαζόντα γράψαι, διοτι τὰς Φωκαΐδας ἔχων Ἡλίουν ἐν Μιτυλήνῃ μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν Ατάρνει καταλλάττει, qui levi manu sanari potest. lege, Φωκαΐδας, ἀς ἔχων Ἡλίουν, ἥδιον — ἐν Ἀταρνεῖ. Et sententia est, Callisthenes narrat Persinum, ab Eubulo spretum, Mitylenam abiisse; atque ibi mirabundum scripsisse, Quod libertius permutaret (sive in vicum impenderet) Phocæenses quos secum attulit nummos, Mitylenæ, quam Atarneo; hoc est, se magis ex animi sententia vivere hic, quam illic. Recte Φωκαΐδας ex MSS. non Φωκαΐτας. Hesych. Φωκαῖς ὄνομα ἔνομος, καὶ τὸ κάκιστην χρωμόν. lege vero Ἀταρνεῖ; nam nomen urbis Ἀταρνές De Persino nihil compéri. Sequitur Cratini locus a Salmasio tentatus IX. 99. Ηανδινίσια πόλεως βασιλεῖς, τῆς ἐριβώλακος, οἵσθ' ἦν λέγομεν, καὶ κύνα καὶ πόλιν, ἦν παιζούσιν. Numeros hic Anapæstos video, quo certissimo silo ex tenebris his expedire me posse videor: lego itaque et ad versus redigo: Ηανδινίδα, πόλεως βασιλεῦ, Τῆς ἐριβώλακος, οἵσθ' ἦν λέγομεν; καὶ κύνα καὶ πόλιν. ἦν παιζούσιν. Quorum hæc sententia est: O Pandionide (orte Pandione) rex civitatis parasitis refertæ: Scis quam civitatem dicimus? Non utique Athenas, sed quam latrunculis ludunt, κύνα καὶ πόλιν. Hoc a Cratino πέπαικται, ait Pollux. Ergo pro ἐριβώλακος (ex vulgata et MSto Salmasii qui habet ἐριβώλακος) lego ἐριβώλακος, et propter versum et parodia ab ἐριβώλακος, quod non *urbis*, sed *regioni* convenit. Εριβώλακος itaque πέπαικεν hic Cratini.

tinus, ut Aristophanes, δλᾶς, Θέωλος τὴν κεφαλὴν κόλακος ἔχει, et alia multa. Deinde, ut offensam vitet, jocose se non de Athenis urbe, sed de ludo verba facere, κύνα καὶ πόλιν, quæ explicabit tibi ipse Pollux IX. 98. καὶ τὸ μὲν πλίνθιον (sic lege, non πλιθίων) καλεῖται πόλις, τὸν δὲ ψῆφων ἐκάστη, κύων. Proximus locus Eupolidis est X. 10. Αὐτὰ δὲ τὰ σκεῦν καλοῖται ἀν ἐπιπλάγιον ἢ κινδή κτησις, τὰ ἐπιπλῆται οὖτα τῶν κτημάτων. Ο γρὺν Εὔπολις ἐν τοῖς Κόλαξι προειπὼν — ἀκουε δὴ σκεύη τὰ κατ' οἰκίαν, ἐπήγαγε παραπλήσιον τεσσυγέγραπτα τοῖς ταῖς τὰ ἐπιπλα. Pro istis επιπλάγιον ἡ, tu, Vir doctissime, refin-
gis, ἐπιπλα ἥγουν ἡ κούφη κτῆσις. satis commode, quoad sensum. Sed restigia literarum vide, et sic potius scribes, ἐπιπλα, οἰνεὶ κουρῆ κτῆσις. Hoc certissimum: deinde tentas; Τέλος οὖν γέγραπται σοι τὰ ἐπιπλα. Prope hoc ad literas, sed nullum inest metrum. Lego et distingo, ut senarius sit Lambicus, Ηπειροπλάγιον τε οιο γέγραπται τάπιπλα. Sententia est, Cum Eupolis prius dixisset, ἀκουε τὴ σκεύη τὰ κατ' οἰκίαν, mox subjunxit (-πάγιγ=) addidit, Et similiter de-
scripta, numerata, tibi sunt τάπιπλα, τυσα mobilia. Τάπιπλα pro τὰ ἐπιπλα primam syllabam producit, ut τάρα. τάδικα, &c. Venio ad locum X. 18. ubi verba Alexidis, Ηἱ δέ μ' ἄγεις; διὰ τῶν κύκλων. et sic MS. Vossianus. mox Diphili ἥστις ex Excerptis tuis, Καὶ προσέτει τοίνυν ἐπχάραν καὶ νῦν κάδον, στραμματα, σινὸν ἀσκόπηρα, θύλακον, ὃς ποὺ στρατιώτην ἔν τις ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλου ἐκ τῆς ἀγνοητῆς ὁρῶν βαδίζειν ὑπολάβωι· τοσοῦτος ἐσθὲ ὁ ῥῶπος, ὃν σὺ τεριζερής. Quos Iam-
bos esse recte calliusti, et sic emendas, καὶ νὸν -σινοντα τ' ἀσκοπήρα, — στρατιώτης — ὑπολάβωις, περιβέγεις. Recte hoc postremum: to-
tum vero locum, vide, an sic potius rescripseris: Καὶ προσέτει τοίνυν
ἐπχάραν, καὶ νὸν κάδον, Στραμματα, σίγυνον, ἀσκόπηραν. θύλακον. "Ως
που στρατιώτην ἀν τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλου Ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς; ὅθιν βαδίζειν
ὑπολάβωι· Τοσοῦτος ἐσθὲ ὁ ῥῶπος, ὃν σὺ περιτίρωις. Servulum, credo,
aliquem alloquitur quis, variis utensilibus humeros oneratum. Tot
res, inquit, curvice gestas, ut Militem te esse existimet quivis (Scis
milites olim omnia arma et utensilia sua suis humeris in agmine
portasse) vel potius κύκλων et totam turbam ῥωποπωλῶν ex foro do-
mum redire: Tanta vasorum vis est, quam tu portas. Καὶ νὸν κάδον,
πε, si vino plenum esset, impar esset servulus tot rebus gestandis.
et autem et e passim inter se mutari, nullus dubito, quin probe
scias. Σίγυνος, quod et metro et sententiae aptum; hastam fer-
ream; inde sequitur, quod στρατιώτην esse suspicetur quis. ὅν σὺ πρ
δον σὺ clara correctio est. κύκλων vel κύκλων erat locus in Foro,
ubi σκεῦν utensilia venabant: Credat itaque aliquis ipsum κύκλων
cum omnibus suis vasis ex foro ambulare: adeo onustus es omni
genere vasorum. Atque hactenus, ut expedite, ita, ni fallor, felici-
ter res processit. Quæ vero postea quæris, sunt ejusmodi, ut nul-
lus sit conjecturæ locus: adeo curta, mutila et mendosa sunt.
X. 26. scapham, inquit, Aristophanes vocat, in quam invomunt, ut

καὶ ἡμισχυρῆς δ' ἐν στοῖ ἐν ποδιλονίων ἐμοῦμεν. quod sic ipse tentas. Καὶ
ἡμί. σκαρφή 'σθ' ὡς ἀνὴν τῇ ποτὸν αἰνον ἐμοῦμεν. Nihil video, nisi Te-
trametri versus vestigia,

Kαὶ μιν οὐκαρφή 'σθ' υ - υ - - υ - ἐμοῦμεν, quale illud,

Ἄνδρες εἰλι. καὶ θησάται, καὶ τοῦ πονεῖν ἐρειταί

Nolim autem, ut conjecturæ tue fidas; neque enim metrum ul-
lum, nec Græcam orationem servat. Cetera piget describere:
neque enim nunc otium est; si vellem nervos intendere, et extun-
dere aliquid. Tu igitur hæc, qualiacumque sunt, *æqui bonique*
consule, et raptim bene vale.

ON THE MARGITES OF HOMER.

THE passages, in which positive mention is made of the Margites as
Homer's, are to be met with in Aristot. De Poet. 7. 8. Eudem. v. 7.
De Mor. vi. 7. Plat. Alcib. ii. p. 94. [edit. Bipont.] Clem. Alexand.
Strom. i. Dio. Chrys. Orat. Ihi. p. 554. Joan. Tzetz. Hist. Chil. iv. 868.
vi. 599. Mar. Victorin. p. 2521. 2572. and Attil. Fortunat. p. 2692. In
the rest, as Hephaest. p. 112. 120. [edit. Gans] Harpocrat. in *Μαργύτης*,
Eustath. on Odyss. K. p. 413. and the Scholiast on Aristoph. Av. 914.
the authenticity of the work is uniformly questioned: as by these it is
referred to, either under the title of ὁ Μαργύτης ο εἰς "Ομηρον ἀναφέρ-
μενος, or in some way otherwise ambiguous. Suidas goes further, and
affirms that it was not written by Homer at all; but by one Pigres,
who inserted an elegiac verse between every pair of lines, taken in order,
throughout the whole Iliad. "Ος τοῦ Ἰλιαδὶ παρεντάδε κατὰ στίχου
ἔλεγειν, οὗτος γράψας Μῆνιν ἄστε, Θέα, Πηληπαδεων Ἀχιλῆος, Μοῦσα,
οὐ γάρ πάσῃς πειρατ' ἔχεις σορῆς. 'Εγραψε καὶ τον εἰς "Ομηρον ἀναφέρ-
μενον Μαργύτην, καὶ Βατραχονυμαχιαν. See under Πίγρης.

The fragments of this poem, that remain, are but three in number;
and are all of them written in the heroic measure. They have been
collected by Winnie, (*Translation of Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry*, p.
193) and are these:

Μουσίων θεράπων καὶ ἑκηβόλους Ἀπόλλωνος.

(schol Aristoph. Av.)

Τόρε [τὸν δ'] οὐτ' αὖ [ἀρ edd]² σκαππῆρα θεοὶ θέσαν, οὐτ' ἀροτῆρα,

¹ With respect to the orthography of the word, I would write *Margytēs* not *Margyrtēs*; as we read Θερτῆρα, not Θερστῆρα. Not more than two or three passages, where the word occurs, have the form *sirys* at all; and, wherever that form is given, one, or more, of the various readings gives *trys*.

² Perhaps we ought to read οὔτε in the place of οὐτ' ἀρ or οὐτ' αὖ.

Οὐρ' ἄλλως τι σοφόν· πάσης δ' ἡμάρτανε τέχνης.

(Aristot. Eudem. De Mor. & Clem. Alex.)

Πόλλ' ἤπιστατο ἔργα, κακῶς δ' ἤπιστατο πάντα.

Plat. Alcib. ii.

We are informed, however, by Hephaestion, that the Margites was not wholly written in heroics, but that these were occasionally interspersed with iambic lines, although upon no settled principle. Μετρικὰ δὲ ἄτακτα, σσα ἐκ μέτρων μὲν ὄμοδογονιέων συέστηκε, τάξιν δὲ καὶ ἀναγύκλησιν οὐκ ἔχει, αὔτε κατὰ στίχον, αὔτε κατὰ αυτήματα, οἷς ἔστιν δὲ Μαργίτης, οὐ εἰς "Ομῆρον ἀναφερόμενος, ἵνα φαίνεται τοῖς ἔπεσιν ιαμβικά, καὶ τῶτα οὐ κατ' ίσον σύστημα. p. 112. And again, speaking of the same metrikὰ ἄτακτα, he says; τοιοῦτος ἔστι καὶ οἱ Μαργίτης Ομῆρος οὐ γάρ τεταγμένῳ ἀριθμῷ ἴπειται τὸ ιαμβικὸν ἐπιφέρεται. p. 120. So also¹ Joannes Tzetzes, Hist. Chil. iv. 867. "Ακούει τὸν Μαργίτην, Εἰς οὐρὸν ὁ γέρων² Ομῆρος ἱρωαῖμβος γράψει. The verses, thus made up of heroics and iambics, were called, in general terms, ιρωαῖμβος; as ιρωελεγεῖον was the name for that species of versification, which was formed by a union of the elegiac with the heroic. Marius Victorinus: "Hexametro Dactylico trimeter Iambus comparatur, q. em Latinè senarium nominamus, veluti Hexametrum; sex enim pedes Iambos habet, ut ille Dactylos, cum uterque purus ex se figuratur. Trimetru autem appellatur a Græcis, quia tribus percussionibus per dipodias evaditur. Ideoque dicitur et Homerus in Margite suo miscuisse hos versus tanquam pares." p. 2524. Again: "Hoc genere versum, ut supra diximus, primus usus est Homerus in Margite suo, nec tamen totum carmen ita digestum perfecit, nam duobus pluribusque hexametris antepositis istum subjiciens copulavit, quod postea Archilochus interpolando composit." p. 2572. Compare also Atilius Fortunatus, p. 2692. "Sequitur ut de Iambico dicere debeamus, cuius auctorem alii Archilochum, alii Hipponaetem volunt. Sed primus Homerus hoc usus est in Margite." See Gaisford's Hephaestion, p. 360.

If we are to give credit to the last mentioned authorities, Archilochus was not the inventor of the iambic measure. But this assertion appears to me to be founded in nothing more than the circumstance of their considering the Margites, in the state in which they had it, as genuine;³ which it certainly cannot have been.

It is to be observed, that, in consequence of the doubt, which seems to have existed upon the minds of several of the Grammarians, and of

¹ Correct, by the way, the next line but one in Tzetzes, by referring to his Hist. Chil. 597. The line, as it stands, is ἐξηγεώ τις αὐ: οὐ ἐγκυμονήσας βρέφος; where the first word is by some interpreters rendered *ex Inero*, and by others *evirato*, without any meaning in either case. Read ἐξηγεώτα τις.

² Dio Chrysostom, on the other hand, speaking of the Margites, says; δοκεῖ τοῦτο ποίησα ὑπὸ Οὐκήρου γεγονέναι νεωτέρου, καὶ χιτοπειρωμένου τῆς αὐτοῦ φύσεως. Orat. liii. p. 554.

³ "Iambicum usurpabatur metrum ab Archilacho primū, si constanti scriptorum omnium testimonio fidendum est." Tyrwhitt's Aristotle, p. 182.

Eustathius in particular, relatively to the authenticity of the Margites, scholars have been divided in their opinion on this head. Some have affirmed that the Margites was not written by Homer at all; while others contend that the poem spoken of by the Grammarians is a different composition altogether from that referred to by Plato and Aristotle, which alone they consider as genuine. Neither of these opinions seems to me satisfactory. For, since Plato and Aristotle both quote from the piece as authentic, we may fairly infer from thence that such was the general ¹ opinion amongst the Greeks; whose sources of information were certainly more plentiful than ours. Add to this the very great repute in which the poem seems to have been held by them, (and they were not a people likely to set a high value upon a composition of nothing more than ordinary merit,) and it seems almost preposterous to conclude otherwise than that Homer did write the Margites, although not in the form, in which it was afterwards handed about. It was written therefore by Homer, and that too in heroics: and as for the iambic lines, which the Grammarians allude to as having a place in the work, I conceive them to have been interpolated afterwards; and, in all likelihood, by the same Pigres, who foisted his pentameter verses into the Iliad.

As we are told by Suidas that in the Iliad the elegiacs of Pigres were interpolated κατὰ στίχον, i. e. line for line, it is highly probable that the same was the case at first with the Margites; and that, as the poem (like all others at that day) would be preserved entirely by oral tradition, a great part of the interpolated iambics, being for the most part the mere substance of the several preceding lines, or something of the same stamp, expressed in another metre, would in this way gradually slip out of the memory. And this the more, as the ² chain of the poem would not be interrupted; while the ear, being accustomed to the free and regular flow of the heroic movement, would naturally drop the intervening iambics, as discomposing the harmony of the. This may account for the confusion which Hephaestion speaks of relatively to the arrangement of the two metres. Τάξιν δὲ καὶ ἀνακύκλωσιν οὐκ ἔχει, οὔτε κατὰ στίχον, οὔτε κατὰ συστήματα. This conjecture derives additional support from the second of the two passages adduced from Victorinus; from whence it appears clearly enough that in the Margites, as he had it, there was frequently a succession of two or more heroics, but never more than one iambus at once. Compare also the Scholiast on Hephaestion, p. 120. ἀτάκτως, ὅποι ποτὲ τὸ ἀτάκτον ἐποίησε με-

¹ Ἐπεκπίστευτο δὲ καὶ ὁ Μαργίτης τοῦ Ὁμέρου εἶναι. Schol. Aristoph. Av. 914.

² For example, suppose one of the fragments above-quoted to have run thus, with the interpolation:

Τὸν δ' οὔτε σκαπτῆρα θεοὶ θέσαν, οὔτ' ἀροτῆρα,

Οὐ σιτοποιὸν, οὔτε μηχανογέραφον,

Οὔτ' ἄλλας τι σοφόν· κ. τ. λ.

The absence of the iambus leaves no breach in the sense, nor does its presence obstruct it.

τρικόν. οὐ γὰρ τεταγμένῳ ἀριθμῷ μετὰ γὰρ δέκα στίχοις ἐπεφέρει ἵαμβον καὶ πάλιν μετὰ πέντε καὶ ὅκτω.

Yet, although I am of opinion that the Margites, referred to by Aristotle, Hephaestion, &c. is radically the same piece, it is at the same time highly probable that the hero of this poem may have been¹ the subject of many other, of inferior note; and that, in process of time, some passages from them may have crept into the genuine performance. It should seem, however, that these, for the most part, have mistaken the character; and made an idiot of him, whom Homer meant to represent only as wrong headed, whimsical, and eccentric. But the turn of Margites's mind seems rather to have been analogous to that of Hudibras or Don Quixote. Out of these petty compositions would naturally proceed those idle stories and puerile jokes, which have been pawned upon the person of Margites; and which² Twining is, with reason, at a loss how to reconcile with what it is presumed the character of Homer's Margites was. Thus Suidas, in v. *ἱν φασιν ἀριθμουσι μὴν μὴν πλειστῶν ἐδυνηθῆσαν εἰρηνὴν δὲ ἀρχιεπίσκοπον μὴν ἀστοῦν αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθαι λέγοντα, μὴν την ποτρὶν αὐτὸν δια βλάλην οὐ, τοιεὶ δὲ τελείων ἥδη γεγενηθεῖσον, καὶ πυθάνεσθαι τῆς μητρὸς, εἰρηνὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ πατρὸς ἴτεχθη.* See also Hesychius in v. In Eustath. Odyss. K. p. 413, a story is told of him so truly ridiculous, and at the same time so indelicate, that we think the good Archbishop might, without much harm, have suppressed it entirely. Compare also Tzetzes, Hist. Chil. 596. *Οὗτος πινφρονιμώτατος [απ πινφρονιμώτατος] ὡν γέρων ὁ Μαργίτης Ξελανηρώτα, τοις αὐτὸν ἐγκυμονήσας βρέφος Ἐκ τῆς γαστρὸς ἐγκενητεύει; ἀρ' ὁ πατὴρ, οὐ μῆτηρ;*

Hence the word *Μαργίτης* latterly became synonymous with *fool*, *idiot*, &c. Thus Hesychius; *Μαργίτος ἄφρονος, μωροῦ.* Suidas; *Μαργίτης. Λιτχίνης, οὐ τῷ κατὰ Κητηποτίων, ἐ· ᾠρυμαντίν· Ἀλεξάνδρου Μαργίτην ἔθετο. Εἴλαντι δὲ τοῦς ἀνοίτους αὐτῷ Ηρακλειατ., in v. Μαργίτης. Λιτσίνης ἐν τῷ κατὰ Κητηποτίων. Ἐπωνυμίαν δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρῳ Μαργίτην ἔθετο. Καὶ Μαρσύνας εἰς πέμπτῳ τῶν περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἴστορεῖ, λέγων Μαργίτην ὑπὸ Δημοσθένους καλεῖσθαι τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρον. Εἴλαντι δὲ τοὺς ἀνοίτους αὐτῷ, διὰ τὸν εἰς Ὁμηρον ἀπεφερόμενον Μαργίτην, Liban. in πρεστι, υπικῆ ad Julianum; Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ πολλὰ παρὰ τῶν εὑρίσκεται πρητόρων γένιαματα, τα τε πραγματα ταραττοτων, καὶ τους ἀνημους κινούντων, καὶ Μαργίτην αὐτὸν ἀποκαλούντων, καὶ ιθριζόντων κ. λ. See also Plutarch in Demosth. & Erasm. Chil. ex. Lucian.*

And now that I have spoken of Margites in the capacity in which he seems afterwards to have been represented, I shall be at the pains to enumerate some others of the same class; amongst whom we find

¹ Thus Suidas; *Μαργίτης σίνης εἰπι μωρίζ κωμιδούμενος.*

² "It is not easy to reconcile it with some other accounts, which seem to make Margites a lowright idiot; such as, his not being able to number beyond five, his abiding from all intercourse with his bride, lest she should complain of him to her mother, &c.—One cannot well conceive, how such a man should, as Homer expressly says, '*Know how to do many things;*' even though he did them *ever so ill.*"—*Translation of Aristotle's Treatise on Poetry.* p. 194.

one named Melitides. This celebrated idiot seems to have been confounded with Margites himself; for Eustathius tells the very same story of him, that Suidas does of our hero. See his commentary on Odyss. K. p. 413. Aristoph. Ran. 1022. edit. Kust. Erasm. Adag. p. 1023. and Tzetz. p. 74. Another of these, of well known fame, was Sanus,¹ the son of Theodotus. Cratinus in the play, speaking of him, says; 'Ο δὲ ἡλιθος, ὁσπερ πρόβατον βῆ βῃ λέγων, Βαδίζει.² A third was known by the appellation of Mammacuthus. Suidas in v. Aristoph. Ran. 1021. Tzetz. p. 75. Eustath. Odyss. K. p. 413. Hesych. in v. In which passages it is to be remarked that the word is spelt in four different ways, viz. Μαρμακουθος, Μαρμάκυθος, Μαράκουδος, & Μαρακύθος. See the Scholia on the passage referred to in the Rane. But I will quote at full length what Eustathius says on the subject. Συμφίωναι δὲ ὅτι, ὡς καὶ ἐν Πλατὶ ἐδηλώθη ἐπὶ Θερσιτου, καὶ ἀφελῇ τινα πρωτιπι καὶ οὐ πάνυ σπονδαῖς εἰς Γραιαν ἐστρατεύσατο. Τὸς δὴ τις καὶ ὁ Ἀπάγωρ ἐνταίθε. [Odyss. K. 552.] δν Ὁμηρος οὖν ἔθελων σφιδρῶς κακολυγεῖν, προσγει τὸν περὶ αἵτον λόγον ἀποφτικῶν εἰπὼν οὐτε ἀνδρεῖον πάντα οὐτε φρεγήρη αὐτὸν είναι. Πολυμαθεῖς δὲ χάριν οἱ παλαιοὶ καὶ τοιαντα παραγέρονται οὐς γράφουσιν, οὐα καὶ τοιούτων ἐπυρια τις γένετο τὰς ἴσχυρειν ἔθελουσιν. Ἐκεῖθεν τὸν μωρὸν οὐδαμενούς Σάννας καλεῖσθαι, ὡς ἀπὸ τον κυρίου ὄντα πράτας καὶ παράγεται Κρατινος, κωμῳδῶν τοιότον, τὸν Θεοδοτίδην Σαννον. Τῷ ἐκείνων δὲ καὶ Κοροΐδους τεκνα ἀποσκοτίσαμεν, μαθοτες τιὰ Κοροβόν εὐήθην Μυγδόνα Φρόγυα τὸ γειτον, ἑστατον τῶν ἐπὶ οὐρων ἀφικόμενον : φ Ηράμψ δὲ εὐήθειαν. Οὗτος ἔγινεται καὶ τὸν ἄφρονα Μαργύτην, τὸν ἀπὸ του μαργατειν, δὲ ἐστι μωραῖον : οὐ δὲ ποιήσας τον ἐπιγράφομενον Ὁμηρον Μαργύτην ἵποτιθεται ἐν πορων μὲν εἰς ὑπερβολὴν γονίων φυναι, γύμνατα δὲ κ. τ. λ.—'Ομοιως καὶ τὸν Μαρμακούθον, καὶ τὸν Μελιτίδην, καὶ τον Ἀμφιτίδην, οἱ διαβόητοι ἐπὶ μωρια ἥσσαι. Ων δὲ Μελιτίδης ἀριθμεῖν τε μη ἐπισταθαι δέγεται εἰ μη ἄχρι τῶν πέρτε, καὶ ἀγροσίν προς ὑποτέρου τῶν γονέων ἀποκονθεῖη, καὶ νύμφη [νύμφης] μη ἄφισθαι, εὐδαμούσιος τὴν πρὸς μητέρα διαβολὴν. Ωσπερ δὲ τούτοις ή ἱστορία λόγου ἡσίωσεν, ἐν δις καὶ τον τὰ κύματα μετροῦντα Πολύνωρον, καὶ τὸν ἐν τῷ κατινδιην θέμενον ὑδρίαν κειην ὑγροῦ πρὸς τὴν κεφαλῆν, καὶ θλυψόμενον [αἱ θλυψομειον] τὴν σκλήρωτην, καὶ διὰ τούτο ἄχυρι παραβάσιτα, καὶ τὸ σκενος πλήσαντα, ινα [ινα] οἱ δῆθεν μαλακὸν ειη προσκεφάλωσον, οὐτω κ. τ. λ.. To this list may be added two female idiots, named respectively Acco and Alphito; although Plutarch tells us that they were considered in the light of bugbears to frighten children into their duty. From the first of these came

¹ Ερασιν. Adag. p. 1711. Eustath. Odyss. E. p. 545. οὖς:ω καὶ δι παρὰ τω μωρικῶ Κρατινω Σάννας· αὐτὸς μέντοι οὐ τὸν εὐηθη απλὺς δηλοῖ, ἀλλα τὸν μωρὸν ὃν ίσως η κοινὴ γλῶσσα Τζάννον λαλεῖ. Διξέν δὲ εἰληφθειη λέξις αἴπερ τῶν Αστινων Σάννων, οὓς οἱ διώγμαι Τζάννους καλεῦσι, βαρζβαρικους ὄντας, καὶ, οις εἰκός, ευηθεῖς δι αἴπαιδευσιαν. Hence the Latin words *sanna* and *sannio*, Pers. Sat. i. 102. Cic. de Orat. ii. 61. Epist. Fam. ix. 16. But Cassaubon (Comm. on Pers. p. 106.) derives *sanna* from **שׁנָה**, *aqere*, from whence come **שׁן**, *dens*, and **תְּבַשֵּׁשׁ**, *aculeatus* or *ornata*. Hence also the English word, *sunny*. Preucher at once and *sunny of thy age*. Pope.

² Perhaps Εβάδιζεν is the true reading.

the words ἀκισμόν, *accissare, nugari*, and ἀκισμός, *accismus, nugatio*. Cie. Attic. ii. 19. *Quid enim ἀκισμέθα tam diu?* Philem. apud Athen. xiii. οὐκ ἔστ' οὐδὲ εἰς Ἀκισμός, οὐδὲ λῆπτος. Eustath. Iliad. Z. p. 494. Καὶ η Ἀκώ τὸ παροιμιῶδες κύριον· καὶ τὸ κωμικῶς εἰπεῖν μακκοῦν, Ισον [ἴσον] ὃν τῷ μὴ νοεῖν. Again, Odyss. Φ. 49. Κοεῖν δὲ τὸ νοεῖν δύτερον καὶ μακκοῦν, τὸ μὴ νοεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀνοητάνευν. Tzetzes p. 75. calls her Macco. Μαρία γυνή τις ἡ Μακκώ, ἡ κάροπτρον κρατοῦσα, Καὶ τὴν σκιὰν τὴν ἐντῆς ὥρασι τῷ καρόπτρῳ, "Ἄλλην δοκοῦσα γυναικῶν, φίλως ερωτηγόρει. See Erasm. Adag. p. 1669. Tzetzes also informs us that *idiots* were called Blitomammantes, from one Blitomammas no doubt. "Απαντας Βλιτοράμμαντας πρὶν τὸν μωρὸν ἐκαλοῦν. p. 74. Add also Busaho to the number. Βουταλίων, καὶ Κόροιβος, καὶ Μελιτίδης, ἐπὶ μωρῷ διεβλήδητο. Suidas in Βουταλίων.

That the author of the Iliad and Odyssey should have employed himself upon a composition so different in grain and cast from either of them, may at first sight seem strange. Experience, however, has shown us that a genius for the satirical and ridiculous is by no means incompatible with a talent for the sublime and pathetic. Thus, we see, Milton could write those Epitaphs on Hobson, the Cambridge carrier, and that Sonnet entitled, *On the detraction which followed upon my writing certain treatises*;—which, in my opinion, have very considerable merit, and are many degrees removed above those spiritless performances, with which our presses teem nowadays in profusion, and which affect to leave a sting without having a sting to leave. The same may be said of Gray's *Long story*, which contains much genuine wit and humour, and shows great skill in that particular method of versification, without which such pieces lose half their virtue and enamel. And so of Euripides, the author (as it is generally believed) of the *Cyclops*, the only specimen that remains of the Greek Satyric Drama; who in his *Alectis* also has furnished us with something like a sample of what he could do in this way. Thus also we see that *Macbeth* and the *Merry Wives of Windsor* were written by the same person.

But even in the Iliad and Odyssey, to say nothing of the account of Thersites in the former, and of the blinding of the Cyclops, the pun upon the name of Ulysses, &c. in the latter, there are passages less obvious here and there interspersed, which have in them a great deal of the comic. The well known line Οἰοβάρετ, κυνὸς ὕμματ' ἔχων, κραδίην δ' ἐλάφων. (Iliad. A. 225.) savours something of this. The railing speech of Patroclus, on the occasion of his killing Cebriones, Hector's charioteer, has a strong tendency to the ridiculous; and is, perhaps, beneath the dignity of the poem. Homer says that he fell from the chariot ἀπρευτῆρι ἔσυκλος, viz. head foremost; which comparison is natural enough; as, being wounded in the forehead, and that in the position in which he would be (*pronus in verbera pendens*, *Æn.* v. 147.), he would necessarily fall in that direction. However, by putting the following words into the mouth of Patroclus, which were suggested by the idea of the charioteer tumbling headlong—*dive-weise* (as a translator of the Iliad would have said not many centuries ago), he

gives, as appears to me, a ludicrous turn to the whole. Ὡς ποκοί, η μάλ' ἐλαφρὸς ἀνὴρ ὡς ρεῖα κυβιστῷ. Εἰ δὴ που καὶ πόντῳ ἐν ἰχθύσεντι γένοιτο, Πολλοὺς ἀνα κορέσσειν ἀνὴρ ὅδε τήθει διρῶν, Νηὸς ἀποθρώσκων, εἰ καὶ δυσπέμφελος εἴη. Ως νῦν ἐν πεδῷ εἰς ἵππων ρέαις κυβιστῷ. Ἡ ἥ καὶ ἐν Τρωεσσι κυβιστηῆρες ἔσιν. The passage is in Iliad. II. 745. In Odyss. A. 215. Telemachus says μάλ' ἀγρεκέως sure enough, as he professed to say, but somewhat laughably; Μήτηρ μὲν τ' ἐμέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι· αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε Οὐκ οὐδέ· οὐ γάρ πω τις ἴὸν γόνον αὐτὸς ἀνέγνω. This, it seems, did not escape the comic poet Menander, who says: Αὐτὸν γάρ οὐδεὶς οὐδὲ τοῦ ποτ' ἔγένετο. ΛΑΧ ὑπονοῦμεν πάντες η πιστεύομεν. See Eustathius on the passage in the Odyssey, from whom Bentley replaced the true reading ποτ' ἔγένετο in lieu of the clumsy and awkward interpolation of Le Clerc. The sarcastic reflection of Eurymachus upon the bald head of Ulysses (Odyss. Σ. 352.) is singular in the same way. Οὐκ ἀθεῖ οὐδὲ ἀνὴρ Ὀδυσσεῖον ἐς δόμον ἵκεται· Ἐμπητος μοι δοκέει δαΐδων σέλης ἔμμεναι αὐτοῦ Καὶ κεφαλῆς ἐπει οὐ οἱ ἐν τρίχες οὐδὲ ιῆδαι. Whoever has seen a painting on canvas of Old Parr's head, will readily comprehend the joke. The story of Elpenor's death (Odyss. K. 552.) may, perhaps, be placed to the same account. Ἐλπίγνωρ δέ τις ἐστε νεώτατος, οὐδὲ τι λίην "Ἀλκιμός ἐν πολέμῳ, οὐτέ φρεσὶν ἥστιν ἄρηρώς, Οὐ μοι ἀνευθὺς ἐτάρων, ιεροῖς ἐν δώμασι Κίρκης, Ψύχεος ἵμετρων κατελέξατο οἰνοχάρειων". Κινυμένων δὲ ἐτάρων ὄμαδον καὶ δοῦτον ἀκούσατο, Ἐζεπίγνης ἀνόρουσε, καὶ ἐκλάθετο φρεσὶν ἥσιν "Ἄφορρον καταβῆναι ίώτε ἐς κλίμακα μακρίν". Άλλὰ καταντικρὺ τέγεος πέσεν· ἐκ δέ οἱ αὐχὴν Ἀστραγάλων ἐάγη, ψυχὴ δὲ ἀδύσθε κατηλθεν. See also Λ. 51. seqq. The slur upon Nireus too (Iliad. B. 671.) is of this sort. He is there mentioned as being the handsomest man in the Grecian army except Achilles; ² and his name occurs thrice within the space of three lines, but is not to be found again throughout the whole of the Iliad. These instances I have collected and strung together, as they suggested themselves to my recollection. The number will, I make no doubt, admit of considerable increase.

August, 1815.

V. L.

DR. CROMBIE'S REMARKS On the Notice of his GYMNASIUM, sive SYMBOLO CRITICA;

No. II.—[Continued from No. XXII. p. 304.]

AUDAX.—I perfectly concur with the intelligent critic in the meaning, which he assigns to *audax*; nor can I account for the mistake,

¹ Ἡβαῖνγε μικρόν. Hesychius in v. Compare Iliad, B. 141.

² Ἐνταῦθα τρις οὐραῖσσας τὸν Νίρεα οὐκ ἔτι αὐτοῦ εἰμήσθη. So says the Scholiast. See also Galen. Pergam. Suasor. ad Artes, Orat. 8.

unless by supposing, that I inconsiderately adopted the explanation of Doletus, who is guided by the usage of Cicero only ; or of Popina, who says “ *Audax in ritio est ; fortis in laude.* ” This explanation, however, though generally, is not universally, correct. The term, though most frequently employed in a bad sense, and even when this is not the case, generally implying a degree of hardihood, and boldness of enterprise, superior to the conceived powers of the agent, yet is sometimes used in a good sense, denoting a becoming degree of fortitude and courage. My expression therefore ought to have been qualified ; and the same explanation of the secondary idea should have been assigned to *audax*, as I have given to *audacia* ; with this only difference, that the latter is more frequently used in a good sense, than the former. By Cicero the substantive is almost uniformly employed in a bad sense : *Audacia temeritati, non prudentiae conjuncta.* (Orat. Part.) *Audacia fortitudinem imitatur.* (lb.) *Animus paratus ad periculum si sua cupiditate, non utilitate communis impellitur, audaciæ potius nomen habet, quam fortitudinis.* (Cic. Off.) This elegant writer, however, occasionally, though rarely, employs the term *audacia* in a good sense. *Audax*, as far as I can ascertain, is always employed by him in a reprehensive sense, conveying the idea of error and excess. If the learned critic can name any passage, in which he has used the word in a different acceptation, I will esteem it a favor if he will point it out. In the mean time his observation, as it deserves, receives my thanks.

ALTA VOX.—In delivering my opinion of the expression *alta vox*, I have cited in its favor the authority of Catullus ; I ought, however, at the same time to have remarked, that some critics in the passage, which I have quoted, read *nox* instead of *vox*. I have likewise cited the phrase *vocem attollere altius*, which has been offered, as presumptive evidence, that *alta vox* is a classical expression. The evidence I conceive not to be quite conclusive ; without, however, condemning it as a barbarism, I merely observe that analogy is not always a safe guide to purity of diction. And it is somewhat remarkable, that neither Cicero nor Sallust, Livy nor Caesar, ever employ this expression, but uniformly *magna vox*. *Cum legem Voconium magna voce, et bonis lateribus suasissem.* (Cic. de Senect.) *Magna voce hortatur.* (Sallust B. J. cap. 60.) When Cicero also enumerates the various principal characters of voice, he uses *magna* not *alta vox*. *Nam voces, ut chordæ sunt intentæ, quæ ad quemque tactum respondent, acuta, gravis; cita, tarda; magna, parva.*

I would, therefore, recommend to the classic writer to employ *magna* in preference to *alta vox*.

The following observation of Gesner, the critic remarks, deserves attention : “ *Vox alta a musicorum diagrammatis primum*

dicta." The correctness of this opinion has been questioned; and it has been asserted that the very reverse was the fact, the highest notes being marked by characters placed at the bottom of the scale, or musical line, and the lowest notes by characters placed at the top. Whether this was, or was not the practice, there is reason to suppose that the deepest or gravest sound was called *summa* by the Romans, and the shrillest or acutest *ima*. Gesner himself, in his note on the passage in Horace, *modo summa voce, modo hac resonat quæ chordis quatuor ima*, as far as I recollect, (for I have not his edition at hand) considers *summa* as equivalent to *gravis*, and *ima* as synonymous with *acuta*. This is decidedly the opinion of Sanadon, who investigates at great length the meaning of the passage. See also " Beattie on Music." I do not therefore consider the opinion of Gesner, recommended by the critic, to be of unquestionable authority.

BRACHIA—LACERTI.—It would be an act of injustice to the candor and liberality displayed through the whole of the learned critic's observations, if I entertained a conception, that he intended to impress his readers with a belief, that the author of the *Gymnasium* was indebted to Mr. Barker, for the explanation which he has given of these two terms. His language however, though I am persuaded, unintentionally, leads to this conclusion. His words are "Mr. Barker, in the 'Classical Recreations,' had pointed out the circumstance noticed by Dr. C. that the two passages quoted by Dumesnil in favor of his distinction militate directly against it." One would naturally infer from this, that the "Classical Recreations" had been published antecedently to the "Gymnasium." The reverse, however, is the fact. The "Gymnasium" was published three months before Mr. Barker's work made its appearance; and though there is a striking coincidence between his observations and mine, I am far from supposing that the ingenuous and indefatigable author of that work was indebted to me for his very judicious remarks. The subject involves no difficulty; and it is rather a matter of surprise, that the common misconception of the terms in question has so long obtained among Lexicographers and Critics.

These are the only observations, which I have to offer in reply to the candid animadversions of the learned Reviewer. I cannot, however, dismiss his remarks, without repeating to him my thanks, for the liberality, which is exhibited in the whole of his critique; and the approbation, which he has bestowed on the subject of his Review.

Before I conclude, permit me to address a few observations to another Critic, to whom also I am indebted for a favorable report of the same work. (See *Critical Review*, V. 3. No. 3)

In the first place, it is necessary to inform him, that, when I

expressed my opinion, of the inelegance, and the inaccuracy of the Latin compositions and translations, which have lately issued from the British press, I had no particular allusion to "Falconer's Strabo." My remark was general; nor can I easily conceive, how the Reviewer could either question or misapprehend my meaning.

It has been observed, in the "Gymnasium," that, when the accident or inflexion, not the word itself, is either obsolete or novel, it may be regarded as an offence against etymology, as *tumultus* for *tumultus*, *dunt* for *dent*, *amasso* for *amavero*, *jugos* for *juga*. The Reviewer remarks, "Dr. C. is surely using the word *Etymology* in some sense very different from the usual acceptance of it; for with the exception of the word *dunt*, not one other (he means, *not one*) of these examples can be said to offend against what is generally termed *Etymology*." This observation cannot fail to surprise every reader, who is but moderately conversant in the science of grammar. Let us examine it. In the first place, it may be inquired, why has the Reviewer excepted *dunt*? Is it not precisely in the same predicament, with the other examples? Does not the error, involved in it, as well as in the other words, consist in improper inflexion? Why, then, is it excepted, the error being precisely of the same character, with that in *tumultus* or *amasso*? The conceptions of the Reviewer on this subject seem to be neither clear, nor correct. In the next place, it appears necessary to inform the Reviewer of the two senses, in which the term *Etymology* is used by grammarians. It denotes then, 1st, that part of philological science, which consists in investigating the *etymons*, or *radices* of words. It traces the derivative to its primitive, and resolves the compound into the simple terms, of which it is composed. In this sense, it is called by Quintilian *originatio*. It denotes, 2dly, as the Reviewer should have known, before he hazarded his observation, the converse of this, namely, that part of grammar, by which we follow an *etymon* through its various inflexions and changes, including, therefore, the declension of nouns, and the conjugation of verbs. Is there any grammarian, who requires to be told, that the term is employed in this sense? Let him attend to the following definitions. "Etymology treats of the different sorts of words, and their derivations, and variations." (A. Murray.) "Etymology treats of the kinds of words, their derivation, change, analogy, or likeness to one another." (British Grammar.) "Etymology teaches the deduction of one word from another, and the various modifications, by which the same word is diversified, as *horse*, *horses*, *lore*, *lored*." (S. Johnson.) Etymology is considered by Campbell in his "Rhetoric" as that part of grammar, which treats of inflexion. (See book 2. chap. 3.) "Etymologia est ea Gram-

maticæ pars, quæ singularum vocum naturas et proprietates explicat." (Ruddiman.) He divides grammar therefore into four parts, Etymology, Orthography, Syntax, and Prosody. Under the first division he includes the inflexion of nouns and verbs. Nor is this use of the term confined to the grammarians of this country. "Etymologia est scientia ostendens veram dictionum originem, cum reliquis accidentibus." (*Despauter Comment.*) Golius, in his Greek grammar, divides the art of speaking and writing Greek into four parts, Prosody, Etymology, Orthography, and Syntax. More evidence might be produced, if more were necessary. This surely may suffice to show, that the term *Etymology* is employed to denote that part of grammar, which treats of inflexion, and that every error, therefore, either in declension or conjugation, is an offence against Etymology.

I am aware, that Varro, with several other writers in imitation of him, have denominated by the term *Analogy* that part of grammar, which has been named by other writers and critics *Etymology*. But, though Varro has treated only of declension and conjugation under this head, it is evident, that, agreeably to his explanation of the term, the word admits a more extended signification. In fact every deviation from a general usage, or general rule, whether that deviation regard derivation, composition, declension, conjugation, orthoëpy, or syntax, is a violation of analogy. The term embraces all those resemblances and congruities, which we remark in the structure and phraseology of any language. It is a term, therefore, too general to specify the notion, which I intended to express. If this violation consist in false declension or conjugation, implying therefore the use of a word not belonging to the language, I consider it as that species of barbarism, which consists in an offence against Etymology. If the violation consist in deviating from the established rules of concord and government, I consider it as an offence against syntax, which error is denominated solecism.

The Reviewer, I apprehend, is slightly, if at all conversant in the art of teaching. He considers the distinction offered between *tum*, *igitur* & *inde* as unnecessary; and thinks the young student could scarcely err in the use of these adverbs, unless the English were deficient in perspicuity. The same observation he applies to the explanation, which I have given of *ducere* and *ferre*; and observes, that the scholar must be young indeed, who would be apt to confound them. The experienced teacher will naturally smile at the Reviewer's remarks; nor will he need to be told, that in Anglo-Latin translation the young pupil is apt to employ *tum* for *igitur*, *igitur* also for *tum*, and *inde* for both. Nor will he require to be informed, that a boy at school, who has been accustomed to render *capere* by "to take," and *ferre* "to carry,"

may ignorantly suppose, that the Latin verbs have the same extensive signification with the respective English verbs, and improperly employ *capere* for *ferre*, and also for *ducere*. The Reviewer perhaps may be surprised, when I assure him, that I have seen the passage in question, to which my observation refers, namely, "They took him to the Academy,"—*Eum ad Academiam ceperrunt*. When he recommends, that an equivocal term, such as *take* for *conduct*, should not be employed, he betrays an ignorance of one of the principal advantages, which the young scholar derives from Anglo-Latin translation, and seems not to be aware, that the character of the style, as either formal or familiar, dignified or easy, may render the one term preferable to the other. Equivocal words are constantly occurring in oral and written language, without creating any ambiguity; and the young student should be taught to distinguish their various acceptations. If a teacher were to exclude from an English exercise every equivocal term, that is, every term having more significations than one, he would undertake an arduous task, and, if he even succeeded, would fail in the discharge of his duty as an instructor. In the last sentence, which I have written, in which, I trust, there is no obscurity, let the Reviewer say, how many words, as having more meanings than one, ought to be changed. More, I apprehend, than from his observations I should think he is aware of.

It was my intention to offer a few remarks respecting his distinction between *pugna* and *prælium*, and his acquaintance with Scheller. But I have already trespassed so far on the patience of the reader, as well as on your pages, Mr. Editor, that I must, for the present at least, relinquish my intention.

ALEX. CROMBIE.

Greenwich, 20th May, 1815.

THE LIFE OF ISAAC CASAUBON.

(AN EXTRACT.)

ISAAC CASAUBON, one of the most learned critics in the end of the sixteenth, and beginning of the seventeenth century, was born at Geneva, February 18, 1559, being the son of Arnold Casaubon and Jane Rousseau.¹ He was educated at first

¹ This Arnold was a native, and minister, of Bourdeaux, a village of Diois, in Dauphiné, but was obliged, on account of the persecution for religion, to fly to Geneva. When that ceased, he was chosen minister of

by his father, and being a youth of excellent parts, made so quick a progress in his studies, that at the age of nine years he could speak and write Latin with great ease and correctness. But his father being obliged, for three years together, to be always absent from home, on account of business, he was neglected, and entirely forgot what he had learned before. At twelve years of age he was forced to begin his studies again, and to learn as it were by himself; his father's frequent absence, and many avocations, hindering his attention to him, excepting at vacant times. But as he could not in this method make any considerable progress, he was sent, in 1578, to Geneva, to complete his studies under the professors there. By his indefatigable application, he quickly recovered the time he had lost. He learned the Greek tongue of Francis Portus, the Cretan, and soon became so great a master of that language, that this famous man thought him worthy to be his successor in the professor's chair, in 1582, when he was but three and twenty years of age. In 1586, Feb. 1, he had the misfortune to lose his father.¹ The 28th of April following, he married Florence, daughter of Henry Stephens, the celebrated printer,² by whom he had twenty children. For fourteen years he continued professor of the Greek tongue at Geneva; and in that time studied philosophy and the civil law under Julius Pacius. He also learned Hebrew, and other Oriental languages, but not enough to be able to make use of them afterwards.³ In the mean time he began to be weary of Geneva; either because he could not agree with his father-in-law, Henry Stephens, a morose and peevish man; or because his salary was not sufficient for his maintenance; or because he was of a rambling and unsettled disposition. He resolved, therefore, after a great deal of uncertainty, to accept the place of Professor of

Crest, in Dauphiné, and here it was, that his son Isaac learned the first rudiments of Grammar. That he was born at Geneva, he informs us himself; and, therefore, Moretti confounds the father with the son, when he says, that the latter was born at Bourdeauy.

¹ He died at Die, aged 63. Charles Bonarsius, and Andr. Endæmon-Joannis, have affirmed that he was hanged. But his son hath fully confuted that false and scandalous story.

² Who had withdrawn from Paris to Geneva. There had been a long intimacy between him and Casaubon; and that, probably, is what gave the enemies of the latter occasion to assert that he had spent his youth in correcting the books printed by H. Stephens: which indeed is false, though no blemish to his reputation, if it had been true.

³ About the year 1591, he fell into great trouble, of which he complains extremely in his letters, by being bound in a great sum for Mr. Wotton, an Englishman, which he was obliged to pay. This straitened him, till he was reimbursed by the care of his friends, and particularly of Joseph Scaliger, about a year after.

the Greek tongue and polite literature, which was offered him at Montpellier, with a more considerable salary than he had at Geneva. To Montpellier he removed about the end of the year 1596, and began his lectures in the February following. About the same time, the city of Nismes invited him to come and restore their university, but he excused himself. It is also said, he had an invitation from the university of Franeker, but that is not so certain. At his first coming to Montpellier, he was much esteemed and followed, and seemed to be pleased with his station. But this pleasure did not last long ; for what had been promised him was not performed ; abatements were made in his salary ; which also was not regularly paid : in a word, he met there with so much uneasiness, that he was just upon the point of returning to Geneva. But a journey he took to Lyons in 1598 gave him an opportunity of taking another, that proved extremely advantageous to him. He had been recommended by some gentlemen of Montpellier to M. de Vicq, a considerable man at Lyons ; this gentleman took him into his house, and carried him along with him to Paris, where he caused him to be introduced to the First-President de Harlay, the President de Thou, Mr. Gillot, and Nicholas le Fevre, by whom he was very civilly received. He was also presented to King Henry IV. who, being informed of his merit, would have him leave Montpellier for a professor's place at Paris. Casaubon, having remained for some time in suspense which course to take, went back to Montpellier, and resumed his lectures. Not long after, he received a letter from the king, dated January 3, 1599, by which he was invited to Paris, in order to be professor of polite literature. He set out for that city the 26th of February, following. When he came to Lyons, M. De Vicq advised him to stay there till the King's arrival, who was expected in that place. In the mean while, some domestic affairs obliged him to take a turn to Geneva, where he complains that justice was not done him with regard to the estate of his father-in-law. Upon his return to Lyons, having waited a long while in vain for the king's arrival, he took a second journey to Geneva, and then went to Paris ; though he foresaw, as M. De Vicq and Scaliger had told him, he should not meet there with all the satisfaction he at first imagined. The king gave him, indeed, a gracious reception ; but the jealousy of some of the other professors, and his Protestant tenets, procured him a great deal of trouble and vexation, and were the cause of his losing the professorship, of which he had the promise. Some time after, he was appointed one of the judges on the Protestants' side, at the conference between James Davy du Perron, Bishop of Evreux,

afterwards Cardinal, and Philip du Plessis-Mornay.¹ As Casaubon was not favorable to the latter, who, as we are assured, did not acquit himself well in that conference ; it was reported that he would soon change his religion ; but the event showed that this report was groundless. When Casaubon came back to Paris, he found it very difficult to obtain either his pension or the charges of removing from Lyons to Paris, because M. de Rosny was not his friend ; so that it was not without an express order from the king that he obtained the payment even of three hundred crowns. The 30th of May, 1600, he returned to Lyons, to hasten the impression of his *Athenæus* which was printing there ; but he had the misfortune of incurring the displeasure of his great friend M. de Vicq, who had all along entertained him and his whole family in his own house, when they were in that city, because he refused to accompany him into Switzerland. The reason of this refusal was his fear of losing in the mean time the place of library-keeper to the king, of which he had a promise, and that was likely soon to become vacant, on account of the librarian's illness. He returned to Paris with his wife and family the September following, and was well received by the king, and by many persons of distinction. There he read private lectures, published several works of the ancients, and learned Arabic ; in which he made so great a progress, that he undertook to compile a dictionary, and translated some books of that language into Latin. In 1601 he was obliged, as he tells us himself, to write against his will to James VI. king of Scotland, afterwards king of England, but does not mention the occasion of it. That prince answered him with great civility, which obliged our author to write to him a second time. In the mean time, the many vexations which he received from time to time at Paris made him think of leaving that city, and retiring to some quieter place. But King Henry IV. would never permit him ; and, in order to fix him, made an augmentation of two hundred crowns to his pension : and granted him the reversion of the place of his library-keeper, after the death of John Gosse-

¹ This conference was held at Fontainbleau, May 4, 1600. It was at first designed, that it should continue several days, but the indisposition of Mr. du Plessis-Mornay was the cause of its lasting but one. The other judge on the Protestants' side was Mr. Canaye, who convinced, as he pretended, by the arguments that were then used, became a convert to Popery. He used his utmost endeavours to persuade Casaubon to follow his example ; but not being able to prevail, he grew very cool towards him, and ceased to have the same regard and friendship for him as he had, till then, expressed. As for Casaubon, he clears himself in several of his letters, of the imputation thrown upon him, of favoring Popery.

lin, the librarian. He took a journey to Dauphiné, in May, 1608, and from thence to Geneva, about his private affairs; returning to Paris on the 12th of July. Towards the end of the same year, he came into possession of the place of King's library-keeper, vacant by the death of Gosselin.¹ His friends of the Roman Catholic persuasion made now frequent attempts to induce him to forsake the Protestant religion. Cardinal du Perron, in particular, had several disputes with him upon that point: after one of which a report was spread, that he had then promised the Cardinal to become a Roman Catholic: so that in order to stifle that rumor, the ministers of Charenton, who were alarmed at it, obliged him to write a letter to the Cardinal, to contradict what was so confidently reported, and took care to have it printed. About this time, the magistrates of Nismes gave him a second invitation to their city, offering him a house, and a salary of six hundred crowns of gold a-year, but he durst not accept it, for fear of offending the king. In 1609, he had, by that prince's order, who was desirous of gaining him over to the Catholic religion, a conference with Cardinal du Perron, upon the controverted points; but it had no effect upon him, and he died a Protestant. The next year two things happened that afflicted him extremely; one was the murder of King Henry IV. which deprived him of all hopes of keeping his place; the other, his eldest son's embracing Popery.² The loss of the king, his patron and protector, made him resolve to come over into England, where he had often been invited by King James I. Having obtained leave of the Queen-Regent of France to be absent for a while out of that kingdom, he came to England in October 1610, with Sir Henry Wotton, ambassador extraordinary from king James I. He was received in England with the utmost civility by persons of learning and distinction.³ He waited upon the

¹ His possession of that place was a great advantage to him; not only on account of the salary, but because he had then free access to the books in that valuable library, which Gosselin would not permit him to have, as much as he desired or wanted.

² This last accident gave him a great deal of affliction and uneasiness; and the more, because a report was spread, that he himself had charged George Strauchan, a Scotchman, who taught his son the mathematics, to instruct him at the same time in the Popish religion.

³ But it seems he did not meet with the like treatment from the inferior sort of people. For he complains in one of his letters, that he was more insulted in London than he had ever been in Paris in the midst of the Papists; that stones were thrown at his windows night and day; that he received a great wound as he went to court; that his children were assaulted in the streets; and he and his family were sometimes pelted with

king, who took great pleasure in discoursing with him, and even did him the honor of admitting him several times to eat at his own table. His majesty likewise made him a present of a hundred and fifty pounds, to enable him to visit the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. The 3d of January, 1611, he was made a denizen; and the 19th of the same month, the king granted him a pension of three hundred pounds: as also two prebends, one at Canterbury, and the other at Westminster. He likewise wrote to the Queen-Regent of France, to desire Casaubon might stay longer in England than she had at first allowed him. But Casaubon did not long enjoy these great advantages. For a painful distemper, occasioned by his having a double bladder, soon laid him in his grave. He died July 1, 1614, in the 55th year of his age; and was buried in Westminster-abbey.¹ He had, as is already hinted above, twenty children.² We shall give an account of his writings, and of the books he published, in the note.³ This

stones.—He doth not mention what were the grounds of those many incivilities to himself and family.

¹ Where there is a monument erected to his memory, with the following inscription :

*Isaacus Casaubonus,
(O Doctorum quicquid est, assurgite
Huic tam colendo Nomini)*

Quem Gallia Reip. literaria bona peperit, Henricus IV. Francorum rex invictissimus Latianum literis suis erudit, Bibliotheca sua praefecit, charumque deinceps dum virit habuit; coque terris erecto Jacobus Mag. Brit. monarcha, Regum doctissimus, doctis indulgentiss. in Anglam accedit, munifice sicut, posteritasque ob doctrinam aeternam mirabatur, H. S. R. oracula major. Obiit eternam in Christo vitam anhelans, Kal. Iulu, 1614. Aetatis. 55.

Viro opt. immortalitate digniss. Thomas Mortonus Episc. Duaclm. jucundissime quoad frut licet consuetudinis memor. Pr. S. P. Cu. 163

*Qui nosse vult Casaubonum,
Non Sura sed Chartas legal
Superfuturas marmori,
Et profuturas posteris.*

² John, the eldest, turned Roman Catholic, as hath been mentioned above. Another, named Augustin, did the like, and became a Capuchin at Calais, where he was poisoned, with eleven others of the same order. Mr. Du Pin relates of him the following particular, upon the authority of Mr. Coteler: before he took the vow of Capuchin, he went to ask his father's blessing, which the father readily granted him; adding, "My son, I do not condemn thee; nor do thou condemn me; we shall both appear before the tribunal of Jesus Christ." What became of the rest of his children (except Meric) is not known. In 1612, he had a son born in England, to which the King and the Archbishop of Canterbury were godfathers, and Sir George Cary's lady godmother.

³ They are as follow: I. *In Diogenem Laertium Notæ Isaacii Hortiboni.* Morgis 1583. 8vo. He was but twenty-five years old when he made these notes, and intended to have enlarged them afterwards, but was hindered. He dedicated them to his father, who commended him, but

great man received the highest encomiums from persons of learning in his time; and he really deserved them, not only on account of his

told him at the same time, "He should like Letter or note of his upon the Holy Scriptures, than all the pains he could be tow upon profane authors." These notes of Casaubon were inserted in the editions of Diongenes Laertius, printed by H. Stephens in 1594 and 1598 in 8vo, and have been put in all other editions published since. The name of *Hortibonum*, which Casaubon took, is of the same import as *Casanbonis*, i.e. a good garden; *Casau*, in the language of Duvalian, signifying a garden, and *bona*, good. II. *Isaci Casauboni Lectures Theocritica*, in Crispinus's edition of Theocritus, *Genœ*, 1584, 12mo, reprinted several times since. III. *Stra-bonis Geographia Libri xvii. Graeca et Latine, et Galil. Xylandri Interpretati-mē, edidit cum Commentariis Isaci Casauboni. Genœ*, 1587, fol. Casaubon's notes were reprinted, with additions, in the Paris edition of Strabo in 1620, and have been inserted in all other editions since. IV. *Norum Testamentum Graecum, cum Notis Isaci Casauboni in quatuor Evangelia et Actis Apostolorum. Genœ*, 1597, 1610. These notes were reprinted afterwards at the end of Whately's edition of the New Testament, Lond., and inserted in the *Critici Sacri*. V. *Animadversiones in Dionysium Halicarnassensem*, in the edition of Dionysius Halicarnassensis, published by our author with Albinus Portus's Latin version, Genœ, 1583, fol. These were written in haste, and are of no great value. VI. *Palaestri Strategematum, Libri viii. Graece et Latine, edidit cum Notis Isaci Casaubono. Lugduni*, 1589, 1610. Casaubon was the first who published the Greek text of this author. The Latin version, joined to it, was done by Justus Vulten, and first published in 1550. VII. *Dicēarchi Geographia quædam, sive de Statu Graecie; Eiusdem descriptio Graecæ versibus Graecis Iambicis, ad Theophrastum; cum Isaci Casauboni et Henr. Stephani notis. Genœ*, 1539, 8vo. VIII. *Aristotelis Opera Graeca, cum variorum Interpretatione Latina, et variis Lecturebus et Castigationibus Isaci Casauboni. Lugduni*, 1590, fol. *Genœ*, 1605, fol. These notes are only marginal, and were composed at leisure hours. IX. C. *Plinei Cæ. Sec. Epist. lib. ix. Eiusdem et Trajan. apud Epist. amictæ. Eiusdem Pl. et Pauci, Momerti, Nazarii Panegyrici. Item Claudiani Faugyraci. Adiectæ sunt Isaci Casauboni Notæ in Epist. Cœ. a. 1591, 12mo. Ibid. 1599, 1605, 1610, and 1611, 12mo. These notes are but very short. X. *Theophrasti Characteres Ethici Graece et Latine, et versione et cum commentario Isaci Casauboni. Lugduni*, 1592, 12mo and 1613, 12mo. This latter edition is the more exact of the two, being revised by the author. Casaubon's edition of Theophrastus is still highly esteemed, and was one of those works which procured him most reputation. Joseph Scaliger highly extols it. XI. *I. Apuleii Apolo-gia, cum Isaci Casauboni Castigationibus. Typis Comitatis*, 1593, 4to. In this edition, he showed himself as able a critic in the Latin, as he had done before in the Greek tongue. It is dedicated to Joseph Scaliger. XII. C. *Suetonii Tranquilli Opera cum Isaci Casauboni Animadversionibus. Genœ*, 1593, 4to. Item editio altera emendata et aucta. Paris, 1610. This second edition is enlarged. XIII. *Publio Syri Mimi, sive sententiae selectæ, Latine, Graece verse, et Notis illustrata per Jos. Scaligerum; cum præfatione Isaci Casauboni. Lugd. Batv. 1598. 8vo.* XIV. *Athenæi Deipnosophistarum, Libri xv. Graece et Latine, Interpreti Jacobo Dalechampio, cum Isaci Casauboni Animadversionibus, Libris xv. Lugdum, 1600, 2 vol. fol. Ibid. 1612, 2 vol. fol.* Casaubon's notes take up the second volume, and are very large, and full of great learning. XV. *Historia Augustæ Scriptores, cum commen-**

extensive knowledge, but likewise of his modesty, sincerity, and probity. Some writers, indeed, even of the reformed religion, have

tarso Isaaci Casauboni. Paris 1603, 4to. reprinted at Paris in 1620, with Salmasius's Commentaries on the same authors, fol. and at Leiden, in 1670, 2 vol. two. XVI. *Datriba ad Dionis Chrysostomi Orationes*, published in the edition of that author by Frederick Morel, at Paris, 1604, fol. XVII. *Persie Satyr et revisione et cum Commentarii. Isaaci Casauboni.* Paris, 1605, 8vo. Lond. 1647, 8vo. These notes upon Persius are lectures he had formerly read at Geneva. They were enlarged in the edition of 1647. Scaliger used to say of them, "That the sauce was better than the fish," i.e. The commentary better than the text. XVIII. *De Satyrica Graecorum Poet, et Romanorum Satyra Libri duo.* Paris, 1605, 8vo. In this work Casaubon alumnus, That the Satyr of the Latins was very different from that of the Greeks. In this he is contradicted by Daniel Heinsius, in his two books, *De Satyra Horatiana.* Lugd. Batava 1629, 1emo. But the learned Ezekiel Spanheim, after having examined the arguments of these two learned men, hath declared for Casaubon. Cremius hath inserted this tract of Casaubon, in his *Museum Philologum et Historicum.* Lugd. Batav. 1699, 8vo. and also the following piece, which was published by our author, at the end of his two books, *De Satyrica poes, &c.* XIX. *Cyclopi Euripides Latinitate donata a Q. Septimio Fiorense.* XX. *Gregori Nysseni Epistola ad Eustathium, Ambrosium, et Basili am, Graece, et Latine, cum notis I. Casauboni.* Paris, 1601, 8vo. *Hannibal,* 1607, 8vo. This letter was first published by Casaubon. XXI. *De Libertate Ecclesiastica Liber,* 1607, 8vo. pages 264. This book was composed by the author during the disputes between Pope Paul V. and the republic of Venice; and contained a vindication of the rights of sovereigns against the encroachments of the court of Rome. But those differences being adjusted while the book was printing, King Henry IV. caused it to be suppressed. However, Casaubon having sent the sheets, as they came out of the press, to some of his friends, some of the copies were preserved. Melchior Goldast inserted that fragment in his *Collectanea de Monarchia S. Imperii,* Tom. I. pag. 674, and Almeloveen reprinted it in his edition of our author's letters. XXII. *Inscriptio vetus dedicacionis fundi continuus, ab Herode Rege facta, cum Notis Isaaci Casauboni.* This small piece, published in 1607, hath been inserted by T. Cremius in his *Museum Philologum.* Casaubon's notes are short, but learned: however, he appears to have been mistaken, in ascribing the inscription on which they were made to Herod, king of Judea, instead of Herodes the Athenian. XXIII. *Polybi Operu, Graece, et Latine ex versione Isaaci Casauboni.* Accedit *Aeneas Tractatus de toleranda obuidone, Graece et Latine.* Paris, 1609, fol. et *Hannibal,* 1609, fol. The Latin version of these two authors was done by Casaubon; who intended to write a commentary upon them, but went no farther than the first book of Polybius, being prevented by death. What he did of that was published after his decease. The great Thuanus, and Fronto Duceus, the Jesuit, were so pleased with the Latin version, that they believed it was not easy to determine, whether Casaubon had translated Polybius, or Polybius Casaubon—ut non facile dici posse credarent, *Polybiunne Casaubonis, an Casaubonum Polybius convertisset.* At the head of this edition there is a dedication to King Henry IV. which passes for a master-piece of the kind. And, indeed, Casaubon had a talent for such pieces, as well as for prefaces. In the former, he praises without low severity, and in a manner remote from flattery: in the latter, he lays open the design and excellencies of the

undervalued him, and called him a half-divine. But the reason was, because he did not entirely agree with their sentiments in

books he publishes, without ostentation, and with an air of modesty. So that he may serve as a model for such performances. XXIV. He published *Josephi Scaligeri Opuscula varia*. *Paris*, 1610, 4to. *Et Francofurti*, 1612, 8vo. with a preface of his own. XXV. *Ad Frontonem Duecum Epistola, de Apologia, Jesuitarum nomine, Parisis edita*. *Londini*, 1611, 4to. Casaubon, after his coming to England, was forced to alter the course of his studies, and to write against the Papists, in order to please his patron, King James I, who affected to be a great controversialist. He began with this letter, dated July 2, 1611, which is the 730th in Almeloveen's collection, and for which King James made him a considerable present. It is a confutation of *la Reponse Apologétique à l' Anti-coton, par François Bonald. Au Pont.* 1611, 8vo. XXVI. *Epistola ad Georgium Michaelem Lingelshemum de quodam libello Scipii*, 1612, 4to. This letter is dated Aug. 9, 1612, and is the 828th of Almeloveen's collection. XXVII. *Epistola ad Cardinalem Perronium*. *Londini*, 1612, 4to. This letter, which is the 838th in Almeloveen's collection, is dated Novemb. 9, 1612. It is not so much Casaubon's own composition, as an exact account of the sentiments of King James I, whose, and the Church of England's, secretary he was, as he tells us, with regard to some points of religion. Accordingly, it was inserted in the edition of that King's works, published in 1619 by Dr. Montague, Bishop of Winchester. It is written with moderation. Cardinal du Perron undertook to give an answer to it, which was left unfinished at his death. It has been likewise unadvertised upon by Valentine Smalcins, the Socinian, in his *Ad Isaacum Casaubonum Parænesis*. *Racovia*, 1614, 4to. published under the name of Anton. Reuchlin. XXVIII. *De Rebus sacris et Ecclesiasticis Exercitationes xvi. Ad Cardinalis Baronii Prolegomena in Annales, et primam eorum partem, de Domini nostri Jesu Christi Nativitate, Vita, Passione, Assumptione*. *Londini*, 1614, fol. *Francofurti*, 1615, 4to. *Genevæ*, 1655 et 1663, 4to. What was the occasion of this work we learn from Mr. Bernard: namely, That soon after Casaubon's arrival in England, Peter de Moulin wrote to Dr. James Montague, then Bishop of Bath and Wells, to inform him, that Casaubon had a great inclination to Popery; that there were only a few articles, which kept him among the Protestants; and that if he returned to France, he would change his religion, as he had promised. Therefore, he desired him to endeavour to keep him in England, and to engage him in writing against the Annals of Baronius, since he knew that he had materials ready for that purpose. Accordingly, King James employed him in that work, which was finished in eighteen months' time. Niceron thinks, that Casaubon was not equal to this work, because he had not sufficiently studied divinity, chronology, and history, and was not conversant enough in the Fathers. So that he is charged with having committed more errors than Baronius in a less compass. Besides, as he comes no lower than the year 34 after Christ, he is said to have pulled down only the pinnacles of Baronius's great building. It appears from letter 1059th of our author, that Dr. Richard Montague, afterwards Bishop of Norwich, had undertaken to write against Baronius at the same time with himself; and he threatens to complain of him to the King, who had engaged him in that work. XXIX. *Ad Polybi: Historiarum Librum primum Commentarius*. *Paris*, 1617, 8vo. See above, No. XXIII. XXX. *Isaac Casauboni Epistola*. *Hugæ Comin.* 1638, 4to. published by John Frederick Gronovius. A second edition—*Octoginta duabus Epistolis auctior, et juxta seriem tempo-*

every point. For though he was a Protestant, he disapproved of some of Calvin's notions: and whoever doth so is sure to be branded, by the bigotry of a zealot, with the odious name of heretic, if not worse.

ADDITIONAL ANECDOTES, by DR. KIPPIS.

In Sir William Musgrave's collection there is a citation from the History of Europe, Vol. I. p. 163, which asserts that Isaac Casaubon was born at Bourdeaux, in 1555, and died in 1613. This account is erroneous in three respects: in the place of his birth, in the time of it, and in the year of his death. The same history, with manifest inconsistency, represents Casaubon as dying when fifty-five years old, though that was in fact the case: for if he was born in 1555, he must, in 1613, have, at least, been in the 58th year of his age.

When Isaac Casaubon formed, in 1610, the design of residing in this country, Dr. Richard Bancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote the following letter to Sir Thomas Edmondes, the English ambassador at the court of France :

rum digesta—was published afterwards by John George Graevius; at Magdeburgh, and Helmstadt, 1650, 4to. These editions are eclipsed by the following one; intitled, *Is. Casauboni Epistola, insertis ad easdem responsionibus, quotquot hactenus repertiri poterunt, secundum seriem temporis accurate digestæ*. Accedunt huic Editiōni, præter trecentas ineditas Epistolæ, *Is. Casauboni vita, ejusdem Dedicaciones, Præfationes, Prolegomena, Poemata, Fragmentum de Libertate Ecclesiastica. Item Merici Casauboni Epistole, Dedications, Præfationes. Prolegomena, et Tractatus quidam rariores. Curante Theodore Janvō ab Almelovēn. Roterodami, 1709, fol.* The letters in this volume are 1059 in number, placed according to the order of time in which they were written; and 51 without date. A certain writer finds in them neither elegance of style, nor fineness of thoughts; and censures, as very disagreeable, the mixture of Greek words and expressions that are dispersed throughout; affirming besides, that they contain no particulars tending to the advancement of learning, or that are of any great importance. Another owns, that there is in them the history of a man of probity and learning; but nothing otherwise very remarkable, excepting the purity of the language, and the marks of a frank and sincere mind. One author, on the other hand, assures us, that they are all perfectly beautiful; and makes no scruple to compare them to those of Grotius and Scaliger with regard to learning; and to assert that they exceed them for the easiness and purity of the style, which is entirely epistolary, and not at all affected. XXXI. In 1710 were published, *Casauboniana, sive Isaaci Casauboni varia de Scriptoribus Librisque judicia, Observationes sacrae in utriusque Fæderis Lora, Philologicæ item Ecclesiastice, ut et Animadversiones in Annales Baronii Ecclesiasticos ineditæ, ex variis Casauboni MSS. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana reconditis nunc primum eruta a Jo. Christophero Wolfio, &c.* Accedunt duæ Casauboni Epistolæ ineditæ, et *Præfutio ad Librum de Libertate Ecclesiastica, cum Notis Editoris in Casauboniana, ac Præfutio, qua de hujus generis Libris disseritur. Hamburgi, 1710, 8vo.* There is nothing very material in this collection. M.

“ My very good Lord,

“ Mons. Casaubon purposeth (as I take it) to come over into England with his wife and family. His Majesty hath already bestowed upon him a prebend in Canterbury ; and somewhat else will be shortly thought upon for his better maintenance. I pray your lordship, when he shall repair unto you for that purpose, deliver unto him thirty pounds towards his charges of transporting, which my Lady Edmondes, your wife, hath received from me, as by her letter here inclosed may appear. And so, with my hearty commendations, I commit your lordship to the tuition of Almighty God.

“ At Lambeth the 26th of June, 1610,

“ Your Lordship’s assured loving friend,

“ R. CANT.

“ This must be kept close, lest he be prevented or murdered in his journey.

“ Tuus. R. C.”

On the Christmas day after Casaubon arrived in England, he received the communion in the King’s chapel, though he did not understand the language. This circumstance is mentioned in his diary, in which he declares, that he had carefully considered the office for the sacrament the day before ; that he highly approved of it ; and that he greatly preferred it to the manner of receiving in other churches. *Gratias tibi Domine, quod hodie ad sacram mensam sum admissus, et corporis sanguinisque factus sum particeps in ecclesia Anglicana, cuius formulam heri diligenter meditatus admodum probavi, et ordinem agendi nunc laudavi præ recepta apud alios consuetudine.*

From the whole article of Casaubon it may be collected, that he was somewhat of a restless disposition ; and it appears, that, though he met with such encouragement in England, he was not satisfied with his new situation. This occasioned Sir Dudley Carleton to write severely concerning him, in a letter to Sir Thomas Edmondes. “ I am sorry” (says Sir Dudley) “ Mr. Casaubon, or rather his wife, doth not know when she is well. The conditions he hath in England are such, that some principal scholars of Germany, who are as well and better at home than he in France, would think themselves happy to have : and so I have understood from them since my coming hither. If ever he turn his religion, we shall see him a wretched contemptible fellow, or else I am a false prophet.” It is certain, that Casaubon was not pleased with the manners of the English ; and, in a letter to Thuanus, he complains, that those who were acquainted with him before he came to England now treated him as a perfect stranger, and took not the least notice of him by conversation or otherwise. *Ego mores Anglicanos non capio : quoscunque ipse*

habui notos priusquam huc venirem, jam ego illis sum ignotus, vere peregrinus, barbarus : nemo illorum me vel verbulo appellat, appellatus silet.

The ingenious writer of the Confessional owns, that he is one of those who do not rate Casaubon's integrity so high as his knowledge ; whilst Burigny, on the other hand, says that he joined the most profound erudition with the most perfect probity.

Isaac Casaubon is to be ranked amongst those learned men who, in the beginning of the last century, were very solicitous to have an union formed between the Popish and Protestant religions. This is expressly asserted by Burigny, in his life of Grotius. According to that biographer, Casaubon, who wished to see all Christians united in one faith, ardently desired a re-union of the Protestants with the Roman Catholics, and would have set about it, had he lived longer in France. He greatly respected the opinions of the ancient church, and was persuaded that its sentiments were more sound than those of the ministers of Charenton. Grotius and he had imparted their sentiments to each other before the voyage to England ; and Arminius had a project of the same kind, which he communicated to Casaubon, by whom it was approved. Several divines, at that period, looked upon a scheme of this nature as practicable, and, among the rest, Huetius did not think it to be absolutely chimerical. Bayle, with much superior sagacity, entertained the opposite opinion. He believed that the attempt to unite the different religions was as great a chimera as the philosopher's stone, or the quadrature of the circle. Indeed, from what Burigny observes, nothing of the kind could ever take place : for that writer treats it as absolutely ridiculous to suppose that the Church of Rome, though she might remit some point of her discipline, would extend her indulgence so far as to give up transubstantiation, or any other of her doctrines. It is well known how zealously Grotius engaged in this idle project ; on which account it is not strange that he could not find out Popery in the prophesies of scripture. Though, therefore, he was, in general, so excellent a commentator, little regard is to be paid to his authority, where the Roman Catholic religion is concerned. The peculiar bias of his mind prevented him from discerning what, we apprehend, could not have escaped an impartial critic.

It may, at present, appear surprising that several learned men should formerly have been so much captivated with the idea of effecting an union between the Protestants and the Papists. But we shall the less wonder at this circumstance, when we consider the state of men's minds at that time. Numbers, even of the professed Protestants, had not shaken off all reverence for the apparent dignity and antiquity of the church of Rome. The extravagancies,

likewise, and bigotry of some of the reformed, gave disgust to many persons of a peaceable temper. A much higher opinion, also, was then entertained of the importance and necessity of an unity in religion than now prevails. It was not, at that period, sufficiently discerned, that the only desirable, as well as practicable union, is the union of mutual charity amidst discordant sentiments, and the union of mutual toleration and liberty amidst different forms of worship. On these accounts, we ought the less to be surprised at the conduct of Casaubon, Grotius, and other scholars and divines of the last age. But it may justly be thought strange, that any Protestants of the present century should have been seduced into the support of so visionary a scheme. They ought to have known that it was not only impracticable, but of such a nature as should never have been attempted.

ODE GRÆCA,

*In obitum GULIELMI CRAVEN, D. D. Coll. Div. Joän.
Cant. haud ita pridem dignissimi Magistri.*

Sic, ut quimus, uiunt, quando, ut volumus, non licet. TERENT.

Eῖεν ὁν·¹ νεκρῶν τριπύθατος αὐλὰν
πανδόκου βέβαχ’ ὁ γέρων ὅμως δὲ
γῆσυχος, χῶσπερ βρέφος ἀβλαβὴς, Αἰ-
δοσδὲ κατῆλθεν.
οἱ γγελὸς Μοιρᾶν,² βραδυπούς περ ὁν, σε-
σάμερον κέκληκε· τεὸν δὲ ἔδρεψε
λευκὸν ἄνθος, ἀμετέρῳ λιπῶν γό-
οις ἐνὶ θυμῷ.
τοιγαρῶν, τύμβος πρὶν ἀν ἐγκαλύπτη σ’
ἀστάτῳ ν κευθμῶνι, τεᾶν θέλοιμ’ ἀν
μελπέμεν βλάστημ’ ἀρετᾶν, φρένος τε
μυρία δᾶρα.

¹ Dixit Euripides νεκύῶν αὐλὰν, in Alcest. 261.

² Obiit annos natus octoginta.

ἥπιος γὰρ ἥσθα· τὸ δ', ὅρθ' ὁδεύων,
εἰσαὶ¹ τέτραψυ πρὸς ίθύ· κούχῃ
ἥμπλακες σκόπου, μεγὰ σεμνότιμος
μειλίχιος περ.
Ἄλλὰ τίθ² οὔτις τι λύρα γόωδες
πένθιμόν τ' ἡχεῖ μέλος; οὐ τέθνακεν·
οὐχὶ δῆ· καὶ γὰρ³ μακαρῶν ἐν αἷς
τὸν βίοτον ἔη,
τρίσμακαρ, τρισόλβιος. Ός θέλοιμ⁴ ἀν
εὐσεβῶν θανεῖν θάνατον, καθεύδων
Χριστοῦ ἐν βραχίοσιν ἀμβρότοις ἐ-
γέρσιμον ὑπγον.
Δῶμ⁵ ἐμὸν,⁶ σὲ δὲ στεφάνοισιν ὕμνων
στέψομεν· τεῖς γὰρ ἐν ἀγκαλῆσι,
παῖς ἔτ' ἀν, τραφεὶς κορυφὰς ἀπαντος
δέξατ⁷ ἐπαίνου·
ἔνθ' ἄρ⁸ ἐν καλῇ νεότατος ὥρᾳ
ἡδεῖ⁹ ἦς ψυχῆς σθένος· εἴτα νιν τὸ
γηροβοσκήσας· τὰ δὲ νῦν στέγεις τε-
ῷ ἐνὶ κόλπῳ
τὸν σπόδον⁵ γέροντα·—σὲ γὰρ φίλασε,
φίλτατον δῶμ⁵, ὥσπερ ἐγὼ φιλῶ σε,
σφόδρα, σοὶ φενῶν⁶ καθαρὰν ἀνοίξας
κλῆδα βαθιστᾶν.

HASTINGS ROBINSON, B. A.

Coll. Div. Joän. Cant. Schol.

xvii. cal. Apr. A. S. MDCCCXV.

¹ Cf. Iliad. οἱ 403.

² Eurip. Bacch. 1337. Cf. Helen. 1693. Callistr. Scol. in Harmod. et Aristog. Pind. Olymp.

³ Collegium Divi Joannis.

⁴ Vide Porson. ad Orest. 614.

⁵ Hujus constructionis exempla dabunt Eurip. Orest. 522. 1168. Horat. Epist. i. 19. 19. Ad Pisones, 18.

⁶ Eurip. Med. 658.

ODE GRÆCA

*Numismate anno, quod olim legavit D. GULIELMUS
BROWNE, Eques, donata, et in curiâ CANTABRIGIENSIS
Comitiis, quæ vocant, Maximis recitata.*

In augustissimum Galliae regem solio avito redditum.

* **ΑΣΤΧΟΝ** πέριξ ψοφέων κάχλαζε
οδύματος γελάσμασι μυξίοισιν
ἀφρὸς ἄχνας πορφυρέας· τὸ δ', αὔξα,
ποντιὸς αὔρα,
ἀβρὸν ὠρανῶ κελάδημα, πρῆσον
ἰστίου κόλπου Βαθύν· εὗ δὶ οὐγρὸν,
πορθμὶς εὔπτερος, πλάκα θρῶσκε, Νηργή-
δων ἀκόλουθος,
αῖτινες τέγγουσι δρόσῳ θαλάσσας
τὰν χλιδὰν τᾶς κυανέας ἐθέίρας, 10
ἴσθι Γαλλίας κατάγοισ' ἄνακτ' ἐσ
πατρίδα γαιῶν.
'Εν ζυγοῖς ἔστακεν ἄναξ, πατρών
αἷλαν ιμέρρων ίδειν· γεγηθός
δάκρυον, μήνυμα χαρᾶς ἄναιδον,
ώς ἐτρόμησε
καλὸν εἰν ὅστοις, ὅτε πρῶτον ὄψις
φιλτάτας ἔσαινε πάτρας γέροντα.
Φῶς δὲ ἐπ' αἰγλάεντι χυθὲν προσώπῳ
εὐθὺς ἔλαμψεν. 20
“ “ Άρα πατρίδος, χρονία περ, αὔγα
“ αὔθις ἐμπαίεις κεαδίᾳ συνίθης;
“ ἂ πτοῷ ψυχὴν γλυκύπικρος ἀδο-
“ νά μοι ίδόντι
“ τὰν πάλαις ζαλαῖς ἔριδος δυσόμβροις
“ γᾶν σαλεύουσαν. Πατρὶς, ὡς πονοίσας
“ εύτυχῆς Ἐλευθερίας παλαίστρα,
“ χαῖρε μάλ' αὔθις,

- “ τὸν γὰρ, ὃ μέλημα φρενὸς φίλιστον,
 “ τευχέων ἄχαλκος ἄγω γλυκεῖαν 30
 “ εὐδίαν· ὅρφναν κατέδυ σκοτείναν
 “ οὔλιος ἀστηρός,
 “ ὅσπερ ἀστράπτων ἀπὸ δαδὸς αἴγλαν
 “ τᾶς φθισιμβρύτου στερεοπᾶς, ἐπ' αἰαν
 “ φαινίαν ὥρουσεν” Εριν, κύνας δὲ ἔ-
 “ σεισεν ἀφύκτους.
 “ Ζεὺς δὲ ἀπὸ ὠρανῶ χθόνα νῦν ἀπασταν
 “ χρυσέαις βρέξει νιφάδεσσι πλούτου,
 “ σὰν δὶ, Εἰράνα, χάριν· αὖ βαθεῖα
 “ τέρψις ὁμιλεῖν 40
 “ ἐντὸν οἰνηρᾶν κυλίκιων· ἀρούραις
 “ εἰν ἀκηράτοις ἀρότους ἀνίει
 “ Γαῖα, καὶ στάχυς, Ζεφύροιο κινοῦν-
 “ τος, ψιθυρίζει.
 “ Άλλ’ ὅτε Ἀγγλίας ἀλίκλυστον ἀκτὰν,
 “ Άλι; αὐγάζεις φλογή, χρυσόνιτον
 “ ἀνίαν ἐπίσχεις, ἔπος δὲ τοῦτ’ ἀγ-
 “ γειλον, ὅτε ἔν μοι
 “ μνάμοισιν δέλτοισι φρενῶν ἔγραψα
 “ οὔνομ’ ἀείμναστον ἔον· τολοιπὸν 50
 “ ἐσσεται πάντων ἀγαθῶν ἔδις, φί-
 “ λα τις ἀμοιβά.

Λοίγιος βέβακε Δίκας μιάστωρ,
 παμμάχοις φρειδαῖσι βρύων.—ἴν’ ἐσσι,
 Αἴετ, ἐν λαβραῖσι πάλαι θυέλλαχις
 “ ἀγεμονεύων;

“ Τρεις ἔξανθοῖσα τοιοῦτον αἰεὶ¹
 “ καρπον ου κομιστεον ἔξαμησεν.
 “ Αἴετ, ἀκταῖσιν φυγὰς ἐν μήναισι
 “ πολλὰ βεβρυχώς 60)
 “ λυγρὸν ἀντλήσεις βίστον, πρόσουρος
 “ αὐτὸς ἀν· σὲ δὲ εἶλε Δίκας ἀγρεύμα
 “ οὐχὶ συγχεύσοντα πόλεις, ἀναλκισ,
 “ ἀμμορον αἰεὶ

“τοῦ βροτοφθόρου κράτεος.”—κακῶς τὸ
ιστορεῖς τὸ μέλλον, ἀναξ· γλυκεῖα
φρόντις οὐκ ἔτ’ ἐντί. Πέρα διῆξεν
ἔκβασιν ἄτας
εὐπετεῖ πηδήματι Κυρυοκέλτας.
παρβέβακεν Ἀσυχία· πέδον δὲ
αὐθίς ἀστράπτει κατάχαλκον οὐ παι·
ώνιον αύγάν.

70

“Ως ποτ’ εὐρήσιος παρὰ νῦνα Δίρκας
χουσοπήγληκα στάχυν ἐξάνηκεν
αἴα, γᾶς λόχευμα φίλας, ο δ’ αἰθήρ
δουζιτίνακτος
οὔλιον μέμηνε, πάρος περ ἀβρᾶ
ἄτρεμ’ ἐν ποιῷ ψοφέων ὅπλων δὲ
πύρφορος τηλαυγής ἐκίδνατ’ αἴγλα
θυμοραϊστέων.

80

Τὴν μακραίων τις βίστος, γεραιὲ,
ταῦθ’ ὁρῶντι πάματ’ ἀελπτ’ ἐφάνθη·
ἢ ἢ ἀδήριτον σθένος ἐντ’ Ἀνάγκας,
ἢ ἢ ἀδάμαστον.

“Ολβιος γὰρ ἡσθα τὸ πρίν· πάλαι σοὶ
ἀλγέων ἄγευστος ἔλαμψεν αἰών
εὐδίας δρέποντι φέριστον ἄνθος
‘Ασυχίας τε.

“Ως ἄρ’ ὥφελεν τοῦδε δαρὸν ἔμμεν·
ἀ γὰρ ἵμερος δυσέρινος ἐπεισε
σκῆπτον ἀμφέπειν σε, τάλας, ἐπ’ αὐτῷ
γήραος οὐδῶ.

90

Τὰς χαρὰ κακόν τε βροτοῖς κυκλοῦνται
πᾶσιν, οἵ· “Αρκτου στροφάδεις κέλευθοι.
Οὐχὶ δὴν τάνθρώπιν· ἀμαυρὸν ᾧς σκι-
ᾶς ὄναρ ἔπτα.

Πρὸς τάδ’ ᾧν τύραννος ἄγαν χλιδάτω
>NNψι χερσὶν ῥαβδονομῶν.—τοιαύταν
πρᾶξιν εὖ βεβῶσαν ιδών τις δὲν πρὸς
θυμὸν ἀν εἴποι,

100

“ Πᾶ ποχ’ Ἀλιος φαέθων, βρότεια
“ πάντ’ ἐπισκοπῶν φλογὶ, πᾶ κέραυνοι
“ Ζηνὸς ἄγριπνοι, τάδ’ ὁρῶντες εἰ κρύπ-
“ τουσιν ἔκηλοι; ”

*Nήπιος, τί ταῦτα μάταν γεγιωνεῖς ;
οὐ γὰρ ὑπνώσσει Νέμεσις· τάχ', οὖτα,
εἴπερ ἐμμὶ μάντις Υδρίς, τυράννον·
εἰς δέμας ὄργαν
δύσμαχοι σκήψουσι Διός. Βαρεῖαν
ἄψιφον τιθεῖσα βάσιν προσέρπει,
κού μάλ' ὑστέρῳ ποδὶ, τοῦ θεοῦ με-
τάδρομος Ἄτα.* 110

J. H. FISHER

Trin. Coll. 1815.

ODE LATINA

*Numismate annuo, quod olim legavit D. GULIELMUS
BROWNE, Eques, donata, et in curia CANTABRIGIENSIS
Comitii, quæ vocant, Maximis recitata.*

Vivos ducent de marmore vultus. VIRG. ÆN. vi. 849.

*M*USIS amicus, Threicia potens
Lyra Tyrannum tangere ferreum,
Quam pene dilectam reduxit
Eurydicen superas ad auras !
Qui regna noctis visit inhospitæ
Orpheus, et amnis flumina lividi,
Et movit arguta severas
Eumenidum lacrymas querela.
At non minores exuvias gerit,
Quicunque vivo marmore consecrat · 10
Vultusque, mortalemque formam,
Tartarea revocans ab aula :
Seu Marte clarorum et titulis ducum,
Regumque sacras ponit imagines,
Seu conjugem, aut ævi recisum
Flore novo puerum fideli
Dextra elaborat. Spirat adhuc amor,
Fulgetque frontis gratia lubricæ,
Letoque vix tandem retenta
Labra micant tremebunda motu. 20
Felix ! dolores cui Parius lapis
Delinit ægros, aut ebur Indicum,

Qui pascit harentes in illa
 Effigie cupidos ocellos.
 Ergo repostam in saltibus aviis
 Nunc mane myrto, et spargit odoribus,
 Nunc fronde feralis cupressi,
 Sub tacita face Noctilucæ.
 O juu, vetustæ Filia Gracie,
 Quæ saxa dura excudis, et horridas 30
 Rupes, et inspiras auhelam
 Paene animam, facilesque gressus.
 Tu fabulosis juncta Sororibus,
 Pindi recessus inter, Apolline
 Ductore, ludebas, et iisdem
 Castaliæ recreata lymphis.
 Dum nuda terræ Simplicitas adhuc
 Regnabat arvis, atque humili foco
 Lar rite, deformi figura
 Et patulo venerandus ore, 40
 Stabat paternus : quem coleret puer
 Lacte innocentis, et fructibus aureis,
 Quem parva Musarum Sacerdos
 Carmine virgineo vocaret.
 O Diva, tecum templa labantia,
 Et sacra Musis ingrediar loca,
 Blandoque contempler furore
 Phidiacæ monumenta dextrae.
 Hic casta nudam se refugit Venus,
 Intaminata candidior nive, 50
 Manumque prætendit decentem
 Anxia, ne nimium protervo
 Lapsu pererret membra Favonius,
 Furtiva libans oscula, et halitu
 Fragrante suspirans amorem.
 Hic media Cleopatra morte
 Recumbit.—Eheu ! te nihil attiment
 Lusus, jocique, et turba Cupidinum,
 Regina ! quæ sentis per artus
 Insinuans ¹ tacite venenum, 60
 Recline collum fulta manu : tibi
 Languor supinis excubat in genis,
 Umbriæque pallentes Averni
 Fronte sedent, gelidique rores.—

“ Per pectora cunctis insinuat pavor.” Virg. Æn. II. 228.

Viden? juventa et terribili ferox Stat Divus arcu. Quam gracili pede ! Quam veste candenti decorus, Ad tremulum fluitante ventum !	
Talis, diei Rex, volat aurea Rota superbus : Sic Lyciae juga	70
Transcurrit, ant molli renodans Ambrosios premit arte crines.	8
Et tu, Britanni gloria Phidiae, Stans in verenda sede pueriae, Quam Camus allabens adorat Composita taciturnus unda !	
Tune ingruentem iam magis ac magis Audis procellam, ruptaque fulmina ? An surda nil curas imago, Quid piceae meditentur umbrae ?	80
O si, refracta compede, melleos Illa, illa tandem lingua daret sonos ! O si Promethea caleret Forma semel rediviva flamma !	
Eheu!—quid auras, quid juvat irritis Vexare votis ? Tu tenebris jaces Extinctus ; Ah ! nunquam Britannum, Chathanide, rediture cœlum.	
Te nempe somnus, te gelidus tenet Amplexus Orci, et nigra silentia : Nos “ rursus in bellum resorbens Unda fretis tulit æstuosis.”	90

*G. STAINFORTH.**Trin. Coll. 1815.*

SIR WILLIAM .

BROWNE'S MEDALS.

As I perceive that the Poems, which are annually rewarded with the gold medals, left by Sir William Browne, Knt. to the University of Cambridge, are generally inserted in the pages of your Journal, the following brief account of those prizes may with propriety be entitled to a place there as well.

These medals, which are three in number, are cast in the same mould. They are valued at five guineas each ; and were directed to be given away annually, on the Commencement-day, to three under-

graduates ; the first of whom should write the best Greek Ode in imitation of Sappho ; the second, the best Latin Ode in the style of Horace ; and the third, the best pair of Epigrams, one of which must be in Greek, and framed after the pattern of those in the ¹ Anthologia—the other in Latin, and after the manner of Martial.

The first and second were instituted in the year 1775 ; the third not till the year after. Although, however, it seems to have been the intention of the founder that these medals should be given to *different* undergraduates, yet this restriction, ² wisely enough, seems never to have been considered as at all existing ; so that any two, or all of them, may be gained by one and the same person.

On one side of the medals, which are about $\frac{3}{4}$ inches in circumference, is a head of Sir William Browne, in full dress as President of the College of Physicians at London. The motto round it is, ESSE ET VIDERI. At the bottom, and in two concentric circular lines,

D. GVLIELMVS BROWNE, EQVES.
NAT. III. NON. IAN. A. I. MDCXCII.

On the reverse is a figure of Apollo, seated upon a sort of ³ tripod : his left hand rests upon his lyre ; and, in his right, he is holding forth a crown of ⁴ laurel to the successful candidate, who is represented in his Academical uniform, and, in a kneeling posture, is presenting him with a copy of his performance. The motto is, SVNT SVA PRAEMIA LAVDI. Underneath the whole, and in three lines, are the words—

ELECTVS COLL. MED.
LOND. PRAESES A. S.
MDCCCLXV.

Some account of Sir W. Browne may be seen in *Nichols's Anecdotes of Bowyer.*

1815.

Yours,

CANTABRIGIENSIS.

P. S. I have often heard it objected as a defect in University and College Prizes, that, in general, there is nothing appended to them, by which the exact nature may be specified of the merit which has obtained them. In this objection there is certainly something reasonable. Where *medals* are the instruments of reward, the distinction might be made, by recording upon the rim ⁵ the purpose for which they are given, the date, the name of the successful student, and that of the College to which he belongs.

¹ In the Anthologia, which consists of a collection of Greek Epigrams of all kinds and of all ages, a candidate for the prize must be cautious what sort of Greek he stumbles upon.

² Such a regulation, if it could have been mentioned to Sir William Browne during his life-time, must necessarily have received his consent.

³ Ὁς θεοπισθεῖ τρίποδος ἐξ χρυσηλάτου. Aristoph. Plut. 9.

⁴ Laureā donandus Apollinari. Hor. Odd. iv. 2. 9.

⁵ For example, the medal for the Greek Ode might be concisely distinguished thus—*Ode Greca, 1775. Gul. Cole, Coll. Regal.*

Where the prizes are given in *books*, the difficulty is easily removed. The examiner might specify the nature of the prize, &c. upon the reverse of the title-page. This is uniformly the case in the German Universities, where it is done in Latin. Wherever this distinction is wanting, the prize *per se*, in my opinion, loses the better half of its value.

I conclude with proposing, as an improvement, that the Seatonian and Hulsean prizes, and also those awarded by the representatives of the University in Parliament, which are now given entirely in money, be given partly in books; and that those books bear upon them the arms of the University. It never was intended that prizes of this nature should be considered as matter of emolument, but of honor exclusively.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

IN the 10th Psalm occurs the phrase בְּלֹא לְהִזָּמֵן כַּל־מִזְמֹרֶת, that is, "All his thoughts, or, all his machinations and skill (are) there is no God." Why? because, as we find in the preceding phrase, "the wicked man is not humble enough even to make the research," or, "through arrogance, will not make the research." Surely the strength of this phrase not only suits the passage much better than "neither is God in all his thoughts," but is supported by the 14th Psalm in the expression: "The fool hath said in his heart, *There is no God.*"

First Epistle to the Corinthians, 11th chap. 2d—10th verse. In the last or 10th verse, the present translation draws a most extraordinary and inconsistent conclusion from the preceding arguments: "For this cause ought the woman to have power on her head, because of the angels." In a Letter addressed, with permission, to the late learned Dr. Ross, then Bishop of Exeter, I attempted to prove, that some hasty copyist must have changed the inverted and mutilated Σ into N in ἐξουσίαν, "power," and formed into one word the two words ἐξ σύστασις, that is, "conformably to nature or sex." For this cause ought the woman ἔχειν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς, i. e. be covered, as equivalent to ἔχειν κατὰ κεφαλῆς, in the fourth verse. Thus the argument and conclusion upon the *sexual* duty of the woman in this case will be consistent. Query—Would not ἀγγέλους, instead of ἀγγέλους, be preferable, or at least admissible? "For this cause ought the woman to be covered conformably to her sex, on account of the scoffers or busy-mockers."

London, 18 Aug. 1815.

JOHN HAYTER.

NO. XXIII. CL. JI.

VOL. XII.

N

LOCKETT'S ARABIC SYNTAX.

The *Miut Amil*, and *Shurhoo Miut Amil*, two Elementary Treatises on Arabic Syntax.

In the Classical Journal, No. XIII. p. 234, we announced, on the authority of a letter from Calcutta, that Captain Lockett of the Bengal Military Establishment, Examiner in the Arabic, Persian, and Hindooostanee languages, and Secretary in the College of Fort William, had long been engaged in translating and preparing for publication some of the most valuable treatises relating to the Grammar, Rhetoric, and Logic of the Arabs, as cultivated in Eastern seminaries. We now hasten to inform our Readers, that the late Indian fleet has brought to this country a few copies of his *Miut Amil*, printed during the last year (1814) at Calcutta, in a handsome 4to Volume, of about three hundred pages.

The *Miut Amil*, translated in the first part of this work, must not be confounded with those numerous compositions which, under the title of Arabic Grammars, teach little more than the alphabet, and most simple elements of the language; teaching even that little in such a manner as rather to discourage than allure a student--surrounding that which is not in itself very clear or easy with additional obscurity and difficulties. Syntax, that important subject, has been, in the works to which we allude, but superficially illustrated; and the Eastern writers themselves, who discuss its refinements, have generally indulged, as Captain Lockett observes, "in little verbal quibbles and philological fopperies, which tend, more or less, to disgrace almost every work on Arabic grammar."—(Preface, p. ii.) Of these blemishes the *Miut Amil* affords but a few instances, as its author, *Abdoolqahir*, emphatically styled *Alnuhwee*, or the Grammarian (See Pref. p. xv.), displays, within the compass of five quarto pages, "so much skill and ingenuity, and combines at the same time so many excellencies of brevity, order, perspicuity, and precision, that it may be fairly considered, on the whole, as the most judicious compendium of Arabic regimen that has yet appeared in the language." (Pref. p. i.)

Of this distinguished author, whose name D'Herbelot writes *Abdalcaher*, and Meninski *Abdelkaher*, and whom his commentator (perhaps *Ibn Hisham*) styles "the most excellent of the learned," so scanty are the biographical records, that Captain Lockett has been able to ascertain but very few circumstances respecting him. It appears that he composed many celebrated treatises on Grammar and Rhetoric, and died in the year 474 of the Hejira, or 1081 of the Christian era. (Pref. p. xv.)

"*Abdoolqahir*," says Capt. Lockett, "appears to be the first grammarian who reduced the governing powers of the Arabic language to a definite number; and as he lived at a time when Grecian literature

of every kind was ardently cultivated in Arabia, and when, in fact, almost every learned Arab made a merit of studying and copying the philosophical writings of the Greeks, it is not very improbable that the *Centiloquium* of Ptolemy,¹ a work on astrology, which must have been popular at that period in Arabia, gave him the first hint for the title of his treatise on regimen, and produced the *Miut Amil*, or *Hundred governing Powers*." (Pref. p. xvi.)

For the brevity of Abdoolqahir's work, his commentator, in the *Shurhoo Miut Amil*, compensates; and, still more, that able and ingenious orientalist to whom we are indebted for the English version of both those compositions, and for his own admirable illustrations, evincing a critical knowledge not only of the Arabic, but of general grammar, extensive and intimate acquaintance with the Greek and Latin classics, and with modern books of merit in almost every language, and the happy art of enlivening a dull subject.

It is not consistent either with the nature or limits of our Journal to follow the original author, his commentator, or their learned translator, Captain Lockett, through the mazes of Arabic syntax; but the following extract (See Pref. p. xi.) will sufficiently explain the method adopted by Abdoolqahir—" He divides Regimen into two general classes, or departments, termed verbal and absolute. By the first is simply understood, the effect that one word has upon the termination of another; by the second is meant, that specific mark of case assumed by a noun, when used absolutely as the nominative to a sentence. The government, in the first instance, is termed *verbal*, because the change of termination is occasioned by some word either expressed or understood; in the second it is called *absolute*, because the word thus governed is considered independent of all verbal agency, and acquires this peculiar form of construction from its nominative situation alone. Verbal government he then sub-divides into two distinct classes: the first comprehends *ninety-one* specific words, which are termed from their nature *prescriptive* governors; the second contains *seven* distinct classes of words, such as verbs, adjectives, participles, Infinitives, &c. &c. each of which necessarily includes all the words of its own species; and each of these classes he considers numerically as *one*, and terms the whole *analogous* governors: here, then, are all the verbal governors in the language reduced to *ninety-eight*: viz. *ninety-one* in the prescriptive, and *seven* in the analogous class; to which, if we add two in the absolute, we shall have an exact centenary of governing powers."

Among these, as we learn from page 1, some are termed by the grammarians of Arabia لفظي or *verbal*, and some مفعولي or *absolute*; of the verbals, one class is styled سعاعي or the *prescriptive government*; and another قياسى or the *analogous*. Our author then proceeds to the class of *seventeen* particles, which govern the noun alone in the genitive or relative case: these are—

¹ Vide Voss. de Natura Artium. The work is also attributed to Hermes

بـاـ مـنـ عـنـ إـلـيـ فـيـ لـامـ رـبـ عـلـيـ كـافـ مـدـ مـدـ
حـتـيـ وـاـ لـقـسـمـ تـاءـ الـقـسـمـ حـاشـاـ دـلـاـ عـدـاـ

and he illustrates their powers by such short examples as the following—

مررت بـ زـيـدـ I went *near*, and *passed* Zeid—
سرت مـنـ الـبـصـرـةـ إـلـيـ كـوـفـةـ I travelled *from* Bassorah *to*
Koofa—

رميت السـهمـ عـنـ القـوسـ I shot the arrow *from* the
bow, &c.

But those who wish to become masters of the abstruse Arabic Syntax, with all its niceties, must peruse attentively the *Miut Amil* itself, which, in the volume before us, occupies but five pages of original text, and sixteen of the translation; he must also study the *Shurho Miut Amil*, شـرـحـ مـاـيـةـ عـاـمـلـ or “Commentary on the Hundred Governing Powers,” of which the Arabic text occupies thirty-one pages, and the English version two hundred and sixteen, being enriched with the learned translator’s copious annotations, and a variety of Tales and Anecdotes, each exhibiting some certain particle under all the senses ascribed to it in the commentary. From these, without any reference to the particular word illustrated, we shall extract the following حـكـاـيـةـ or story.

“A certain city lounger was standing one day in the street, and happened to see a woman of elegant appearance pass by with a child in her arms. He said to the people about him—‘If any one will bring me that child, in order that I may kiss his feet, I will give him ten dirhums’—but nobody answered him. He addressed them again, and said, ‘I will give fifteen dirhums to any one that will bring me the child;’ but they continued silent as before. ‘I had better,’ said he to himself, ‘leave these blockheads alone, and watch the motions of the woman, and wherever she goes, go there also; and at whatever house she enters, stop there, and wait her coming out;’ upon which he began to follow her. The woman turned round, and said, ‘What is your object, sir, in pursuing me thus?’ ‘I wish’ (replied he) ‘for permission to kiss the feet of that child; and if you allow me, I will do whatever you command.’ ‘Why do you wish this?’ said the woman. ‘Because I love you’ (replied he), ‘and you love the child, and the beloved of the beloved is also beloved.’ The woman laughed at his answer, and said, ‘If you are determined on this, you had better wait for his father, who is about to proceed to the bath; and when he takes off his shoes, you can go and kiss his feet, for my love to him is greater than to this child.’ The fellow was abashed at her reply, and retreated.”

We shall extract another Story from page 180. "The wife of a niggardly attorney happened to be seized with a longing after fish, and expressed her desire one day to her husband. 'O what execrable food' (said the attorney) 'is fish, and how vile a thing is fish for food ! for its F is *fatality*, its I *insipidity*, its S *sickness*, and its H *horror*.' The good woman, however, was determined to satisfy her longing ; and accordingly, having pawned her ear-ring, unknown to him, purchased some fish ; but in the very act of enjoying it, who pops in upon ~~her~~ but old Pinchpenny, who, seeing her eating, cried out, 'What is that you are eating, my dear ?' 'Nothing but a little fish' (replied the wife), which a neighbour woman has sent me.' 'Oh, ho' (cried Muckworm), 'then allow me to join your mess immediately, for most excellent food is fish, and fish is truly excellent for food ; for its F is *fatness*, its I *implication*, its S *salubrity*, and its H *hilarity*.' 'What a vile describer of fish you are' (said his wife) ; 'for yesterday you abused it, and now again you are praising it.' 'Nay, my dear' (said the attorney), 'I am an admirable definier of fish, for I divide it into two classes ; one that is purchased with money, and this I hold to be the bad class ; the other that is got gratuitously, and this I consider the good class.' His wife laughed at his answer, and was surprised at the readiness of his reply."

Our limits restrict us to one story more, which we shall borrow from page 230. "'I resided at Basrah' (said a certain Arabian Yorick) 'as a parson, and professor of humanity ; and was, one day, a good deal amused by a strange fellow, squint-eyed, straddle-footed, lame of both legs, with rotten teeth, stammering tongue, staggering in his gait like a man intoxicated, puffing and blowing like a thirsty dog, and foaming at the mouth like an angry camel, who came up, and seated himself before me. 'Whence come you' (said I), 'O father of gladness ?' 'From home, please your worship,' said he ; 'And pray where is your home ?' (I rejoined) 'and what is the cause of your journey ?' 'My home' (he replied) 'is near the great mosque, adjoining the poor-house ; and I am come for the purpose of being married, and to beg you will perform the ceremony : the object of my choice is this long-tongued, importunate, hump backed, scarlet-skinned, one-eyed, no-nosed, stinking, deaf, wide-mouthed daughter of my uncle.' 'Do you agree, Miss Long-tongue' (said I), 'to marry this Mr. Pot-belly ?' 'Ay,' said the lady, with a great deal of Doric brevity. 'Then accept, my friend' (cried I), 'this woman for your wife—take her home, cherish, and protect her.' So he took her by the hand and departed. Now it happened, that about nine months after that, they both returned to me rejoicing ; and had hardly seated themselves, when my old friend *Adonis* called out, 'O, your worship, we have been blessed with a most sweet and fascinating child ; and are come to request you will bless and give him a name, and offer up a prayer for his parents.' Now what should I behold but

¹ Or, agreeably to the original word, *Kaw*, its first letter is *poison*, its second *sickness*, and its third *affliction* ; and again, its first is *fatness*, its second *enjoyment*, and its third *competency*.

a little urchin, stone-blind, hare-lipped, without the use of its hands, splay-footed, bald-headed, ass-eared, bull-necked, not possessing one sense out of the five, and altogether frightful and deformed : in short, a perfect epitome of all the qualities of his parents. At this sight, I said to them, 'Be thankful for this darling boy, and call him *Ooms-roor*,' for truly he has all your perfections combined in himself, and that child is truly admirable who resembles his parents.'

In the Annotations (page 103) Captain Lockett notices a species of paronomous composition, very frequent among the Arabs and Persians, and occasionally practised by the Greek and Latin Poets. Numerous examples of the Paronomasia are given, he observes, by Vossius, in his Rhetoric, and others may be found in Aulus Gellius, Plautus, Ennius, &c. The following Arabic couplet contains a delicate play on words, that cannot be preserved in a translation. Capt. L. quotes it in his remarks on ئ، the common responsive negative, directly opposed to نعم "yes."

رأيت ظبياً على كثيبٍ بخجل البدر و الهلال
فقلت ما اسمك ف قال لولو فقلت لي لي فقال لا لا

"I saw a fawn upon a hillock, whose beauty eclipsed the full moon : I said, 'What is thy name?' She answered 'Deer.' 'What, my dear?' said I ; but she replied, 'No ! no !'" Here the play on لولو *loo loo*, لـي *lee lee*, and ئـ ئـ *la la*, is inevitably lost in translation. The first means *a pearl*, the second is a repetition of *mine* or *for me*, and the third a reduplication of the negative *no*.

But we must not exceed our limits; and might, perhaps, close this article best by declaring generally, that the volume before us contains in every page something to instruct or entertain. We shall, however, more particularly direct our readers' attention to the learned translator's Preface, and his important Remarks on the term حدث (p. 195 and seq.) which are replete with curious and valuable criticism.

O.

NOTICE OF

Tiberius Rhetor de figuris, Altera Parte Auction; una cum Rufi Arte Rhetorica. Edidit Jo. Fr. BOISSONADE.
Lond. in Æd. Valp. 1815. 8vo. pp. 98. Pr. 6s. 6d.

THIS little work is dedicated to Dav. Jac. Van Lennep, a celebrated Professor at Amsterdam. The circumstances, under which

¹ Literally, "The joy of his parents," being compounded of اب father, and سرور joy.

this publication originated, and the manner in which the work has been executed, will be best explained in the very learned and ingenious Editor's own words :

“ Casu ad Tiberium sui delatus, nihilque unquam minus cogitavi, quam me hujus foie scriptoris editorem. In Codice Vaticano 489, quem aliud quærens evoluebam, inveni Tiberii Σχηματα : et, cum voluisse conferendo experiri num essent editis emendatione, non sine quadam voluptate (nam non carent nostra studia voluptate) animauit Tiberium manu scriptum duplo majorem esse quam editum. Tiberium et alteram partem, qua Figuras Elocutionis exponit, Galeo defuisse, primo hujus libri editori, nec non Fischeri qui Galeanam Editionem iteravit, indiligenter nimium et incuriose : etenim immania priorum typographorum peccata saepius repetere non dubitavit. Sed Tiberium integrum habere nihil erat, nisi et alii haberent. Ergo me ad editionem adcinxī ; at levi manu rem peregi : nam non est Tiberius auctor, a cuius editore nultum exspectent lectores. Galeanas observationes servavi, et identidem Claudi Capperonnerii adposui notulas, a me descriptas ex margine exempli Oxoniensis, quod, post fata viri *προσωπωτατου*, in Bibliothecam Regiam Parisiūm migravit. Hoc eodem exemplo usus est Schneiderus, atqne inde sumsis quas dedit ad Demetrium Phalereum Capperonnerii emendatiunculas. Præterea locorum a Tiberio excitatorum fontes quam potui diligentissime indicavi, varietatesque Codicum Vaticani et Parisini 2918 enotavi : e priore, cum maxima sedulitate ; e posteriore, qui altera parte caret, non nimis anxie : nam sere cum Galeana conspirare videbatur.

“ Parem in Rufo edendo rationem tenui. Rufum dederat olim Tiberio comitem Galeus, sed anonymum. Scriptoris nomen commode obtulit idem ille Regius liber. Inventi nominis fortuna Rufo profuit. Quem anonymum adhuc latere sivissem in Galei et Fischeri libellis, jam volui, recuperato nomine, publicè notitiae luce donare, et ipsi novus quasi pater existere. Meum enim movebat animum fatum illud triste quod ipsi nomen inviderat, et alteram, post mortem, mortem attulerat. Nec tamen paterni affectus justum esse me judicem impediunt, et quam sit tenuis meus ille Rufus optime intelligo.

“ Hic finem præfandi faciam ; nam de Tiberio quæ scire forte cupis Testimonia a me collecta te docebunt. De Rufo autem, præter nomen, nihil novi.”

The notes, with which the Editor has enriched the book, bear an honorable testimony to his learning, ingenuity, taste, judgment, and accuracy. Many of them are so excellent, that we shall easily obtain the pardon of our readers for thus occupying two or three of our pages.

Diotimi Epigr. ἀστραπηφόρης, ἀστραπηβόλος, ἀστραπηβολέω.

“ De „ pro „ in vocibus huic similibus, cf. quæ notavi ad Marin. p. 105. Perpetua est harum syllabarum, propter soni similitudinem, permutatio. Diotimi Epigramma quartum in primo versu laborat.

ἢ Ἡ Ἀρτεμισία αὐτὸς ὁ χαλκεὺς Μαρύνη. Non faciunt satis Brunckii et Jacobii conatus. Propono ἢ Ἡ Ἀρτεμισία—Anonymus qui editur in *Notitiis Manuscriptorum*, t. 6. p. 500. eodem modo vitiatus est: ἢν οὖσθει βασιλίους σισάπαι. Lege, ἢν οὗσθει βασι—Alia obiter in hujus auctoris carmine emendabo: at meam mihi in ignobilissimo poetastro corrigendo sedilitatem nemo exprobret; nam dignus est emendatione, qui fuit habitus editione dignus. Vers. 5. ὅχος εἰπεῖον ὡν χρυσόλατον ξένον. Editor doctissimus proponit ὄλος ταῦτα πρότερον ὄλος ταῦτα. Quam sæpe permutentur λ et χ docuit Bastius ad Gregorium. Sed ταῦτα non mutandum; ταῦτα versum facit sequo longiorem. Metrum enim est iambicum politicum dodeca-syllabum, cum accentu in penultima, non servato ubique iambo finali. Ab hac norma recedere videtur versus undecimus, desinens in ἴωσφόρος: sed accentum male imposuit vel librarius, vel hypotheta. Legendum ἴωσφόρος.—v. 27. αὐτῷ θεοῖσι χάρειν ἀστραπηφόρος. Lego, αὐτοῦ. Voce ἀστραπηφόρος caret H. Stephani Thesaurus, qui nec habet epithetum ejusdem commatis, ἀστραπηβόλος, inveniendum apud Eumathium vi. p. 197. nec verbum ἀστραπηβόλει. Eumathio iii. p. 70. pro ἐκ νεφών ἀστραβολῆι, restituo ἀστραπηβολῇ. * * * * * Auctori nota meioris, Philoxeno Athenæi i. 8. nocet particula γι. Σκορπ'ος αὐτούς γι, σοῦ τὸν πρωτότον ὑπελάσιν. Non dicitur quid vel quem scorpius sedaverit. Lego: Σκ. αὐτούς σι, σοῦ τ. π. ὑ. vel Σκ. αὐτούς γέ σι, σοῦ τ. πρ. ὑ. Elmsleius, vir egregius, ad Acharn. Auct. p. 116. huic loco alia ratione mederi conatus est.” p. 17, 18.

LYSIAS Epitaph. explained.

“ Lysias Epitaph. p. 95. R. Ἀθηναῖος μὲν ἐνίκαν τῇ ταύτῃ φέρει, Λακεδαιμονίος δὲ, οὐδὲν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἰδεῖς γενόμενοι. Supplementa hiatus proposuerunt docti interpretes, et Augerius, semper audacior, scripsit e conjectura Reiskii quem, de more, nominare neglexit, Λακεδαιμονίος δὲ ἰδυστήχησαν. Evidem credo hic esse ἀποτικτονι, et scribendum Λακεδαιμονίος δὲ . . . οὐδεν.” p. 25.

PLUTARCH corrected.

“ Sæpe notatum est quam frequenter και et ει permutentur, et nuper a Letronnio, viro juvene a quo egregia speranda sunt, in Animadversionibus ad Diculum. Vide Porson. ad Odyss. Γ. 278. Haec observatione Plutarcho proderit de Aud. poet. p. 90. Krebs. κατέπιειν ει υθε φατι και κικηραμένοις μύθοις ἀλλοιας. Wyttenbachius, quam opportune obtulerunt codices lectionem, κικηραμένος recepit. Jam locus erit omnino restitutus, deleto και, nato e prava iteratione initialis syllabæ vocis κικηραμένος: ‘in adulterina luce veritatis temperata fabulis.’ Hic perfecti reduplicatio, και, peperit ex se conjunctionem και: alibi syllaba και prorsus evanuit, mutata male in conjunctionem, verbi causa, και κικηραμένος pro κικηρικένος. Vide notam ad Marinum p. 98.” p. 26.

Σαφῆνεια, a rhetorical word.

In p. 30. Professor B. quotes the words of Mr. Blomfield in Gloss. ad Sept. Theb. “ σαφῆνεια, vox rarer,” and adds that H. Stephens in the *Thes.* notices it as a word of rare occurrence in

prose. Mr. Bl. was in all probability led by H. Stephens to make the remark, which, however true it may be with respect to the historians, orators, and poets, is untrue in regard to the rhetorical writers. Boissonade well observes "rhetoribus placuit," and he appeals to Aristotle Poet. c. 37, to Theo Progymn. p. 31, 32. ed. Camer, to Aphthon. Progymn. p. 4. Commel., to Aristides T. II. p. 475, to Rufus s. 16, 17., Demetr. s. 202., Hermogenes de Form. II. 11, p. 489., to Matth. Camariota p. 10. 24. 25., to Apsines, and others. We had ourselves lately occasion to read a very considerable part of Hermogenes, and there we met with the word not only in the places referred to by Professor B., but in several other passages. It may be found often in Dionysius Halic. "Aristoteli σαφῆς λέξις est, quæ medium tenet inter ἀδολεσχίαν et συντομίαν, loquacitatem et nimiam brevitatem Lib. III. *Rhet.* cap. 12. fin. Diog. Laert. X. 10. commemorat Epicuri λέξιν κυριαν καὶ ιδιωτάτην, deinde addit: σαφής ἦν οὐτως, ως καὶ ἐν τῷ περὶ ῥητορικῆς ἀξιοῦ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἢ σαφήνειαν ἀπαιτεῖν." Ernesti Lex. Technol. Gr. Rhet. p. 305. Ernesti thus defines the word: "Σαφήνεια, claritas orationis, prima ejus virtus ex disciplina Hermogenis Lib. I. περὶ id. p. 26. quæ constat duabus rebus, τῷ καθαρῷ et εὐχρινεῖ, puritate et perspicuitate."

PLUTARCH corrected.

"Plutarchus de Superstit. s. 16. p. 54. Matth. οὐδὲ διενὸν ἐν καιρῷ ποδῶν σκιᾶς πρὸς οὐλήν ἀπαντησόντος. Sudant interpretes in explicando vel corrigendo ποδῶν, nec proficiunt hilum. Conjecti πάγω σκιᾶς quod verum esse omnino videtur. Locutio est poetica, quam potuit de more Plutarchus a poeta quodam mutuari, Aeschylō forte, vel Pindaro. Πάγου σκιᾶς est conus umbræ. Vide Albertium ad Hesychii Πάγου." p. 36.

We entirely agree with the Professor in the propriety of this conjecture.

Aeschylus *Agam.* v. 314. φλογὸς μέγαν πώγωνα. Stanley translates the words thus, *promissam ignis barbam.* Schol. A. Πώγωνα λέγει τὴν εἰς ὅξὺ λήγουσαν ἀκμὴν τοῦ πυρός· καὶ ὁ πώγων γὰρ εἰς ὅξὺ λήγει· ὥσπερ καὶ ἀλαχοῦ Αὐθάδη γνάθον τὴν ἀκμὴν εἴσηκε, καὶ ὅξύτητα τῆς σφηνός (Prom. Vinct. 64.). σημειώσαι δὲ ὅτι ἐκ τούτου ὀνομάσθη παρὰ τοῖς μετεωρολόγοις πώγωνίας ἀστήρ. "Iisdem verbis," says Stanley, "rationem præbet Scholiastes Homeri antiquus, quare πώγων, Latinis *Pogonius*, Trœzeniorum portus appellatus fuerit, πώγων δὲ, inquit, ἐκλήθη ἀπὸ μεταφορᾶς τοῦ πώγωνος, διότι λήγει εἰς ὅξυ. Porro ad hujus loci nomen allusisse videri Aeschylum putat vir cl. in Pompon. Mel. ii. 3. *Tanquam si a face Agamemnonia esset appellatus.* Hunc Aeschylī locum respexit Jul. Pollux Onomast. II. 4. ἐν τῇ τραγῳδίᾳ, Πώγων πυρὸς, ἡ εἰς ὅξὺ ἀναδρομὴ τῆς φλογός." "Pogonias vocant," says Pliny, "quibus inferiore ex parte

in speciem barbæ longæ promittitur juba," Lib. II. 25. Manilius Lib. I. v. 837.

Et globus ardantis sequitur sub imagine barbæ.

We may observe that the astronomical use of the word as applied to *comets with their fiery tails* may have suggested to Plutarch, when speaking, as he appears to do, astronomically, the use of it in the passage under consideration.

Carcini nomen in Catalogo Rhetorum.

" Alexander Rhet. ii. 2. de anadiplosi : τοῦτο τὸ σχῆμα ὁ μὲν Καρκίνος παπιλλούσας καλεῖ. Normannus pro Καρκίνος, reponi volebat Καικίλιος. Vides iterum nomen Cæciliæ depravatum ; nam nullus dubito quin vera sit Normanni emendatio, delendumque Carcini nomen in Catalogo Rhetorum Fabriciano." p. 44.

ῳ γάμοι, γάμοι, proverbially used.

In p. 45 we have the phrase *ῳ γάμοι, γάμοι*, numbered among the instances of the figure "epanalepsis." The Professor says in the note : " Hæc forte petita e Tragico. Apostolius XXI. 9. ὠ γάμοι, γάμοι, ἐπὶ τῶν δυστυχούντων. Pantinus reponendum arbitratur, ὠ γάμοι ἄγαμοι. Facile quis videt Pantinum errare." We are surprised that the real source of the phrase *ῳ γάμοι, γάμοι*, which Apostolius numbers among his proverbs, should not have occurred to a memory so exact, and ready, and rich as that of the Professor on most occasions.

ῳ γάμοι, γάμοι
ἰφύταθ' ἡμᾶς, καὶ φυτεύσαντες, πάλιν
ἀνεῖτε τάντον σπέρμα, καὶ πεδεῖξατε
πατέρας, ἀνέλαρους, παιδας, αἱμ' ἐμφύλιον,
νύμφας, γυναῖκας, αητεῖς τε, χώρός α
αισχιττ' ἐν ἀνθρώποισι ἔργα γίγνεται.

Sophocles *Ed. T. v. 1403. ex ed. Elms.*

The Professor will recollect the notice taken of the passage by the Pseudo-Longinus π. v. sect. 23. The proverb cannot trace its origin higher than Sophocles.

ÆSCHINES corrected : ἐπίσταμαι, γιγνώσκω.

" Πλεονάζει Æschines in Timarch. p. 44. R. ἐπιδέι . . . τὸν νόμον γνῶ καὶ εἰδῆ. Sed Codex Coislinianus vocibus γνῶ καὶ caret, hocque ad pictum habet scholium : εἰδῆ περιστομίως ἀναγνωστιν ἀντὶ τοῦ ιὰς γνῶ καὶ εἰδῆ. Crediderim Æschinem scripsisse tantum νόμους εἰδῆ, et e scholio marginali γνῶ καὶ irrepuisse." p. 55.

Though we are disposed to think with Mr. B. that *γνῶ καὶ* is a marginal gloss, yet we are afraid to speak positively, and respectfully submit to the consideration of this truly enlightened Parisian the following instance of pleonasm, which seems in a great measure to vindicate the propriety of *γνῶ καὶ* in the passage of Æschines :

τὰ χρήστ' ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γιγνώσκομεν,

Eurip. Hippol. v. 382.

θυσίας ἐπιστάμεσθα καὶ γιγνώσκουμεν.

Eurip. Iphig. Taur. p. 490.

On this second passage J. Markland judiciously writes thus : “*Novimus et scimus* : τῆς ταυτίτης suspicionem leviorēm fore putaverit forte aliquis, si legatur, κ' εὐ γινώσκομεν. et probe cognita habemus. Sed reclamat ipse Euripides Hipp. 380. et D. Lucas ^{Apost.} xix. 15. [Τὸν Ἰησοῦν γινώσκω, καὶ τὸν Παῦλον ἐπίσταμαι] Plautus Mil. Glor. II. 5. 42. *Neque vos, qui homines sitis, Jovi, neque scio.*” But to the passage produced from the Acts it may be well objected that the two verbs are introduced, where one might have been sufficient, merely for the sake of variety, and do not in this instance bear the same appearance of pleonasm, which is visible in the passages of Aeschines, Euripides, and Plautus ; and therefore we subjoin the following example : Marc. xiv. 68. οὐδὲ οὐδὲ ἐπισταμαι, τί σὺ λέγεις.

ATHENÆUS corrected.

“ Non abs re erit Anaxandridem Athenai l. 62. ἀσυνδίπτω liberare, quod in ejus versus inopportune invexerunt librarii : iār λούσοντε νῦν, ‘Ράφανόν τε πολλὴν ἵτεράντη, παύσιτι Τὸ βάρος, διασκεδάτη τὸ προσών νῦν νίφος; Ἐπὶ τοῦ μετάποντος. Quis non offendet ad παύσιτι, διασκεδάτη? Lego: ‘Ράφανόν τε πολλὴν ἵτεράντη, ἐπαυσί τε Τὸ βάρος, διασκεδάτη τὸ πρό—’Ἐπαυσί, ἡ αὐτος, πεμπε.—Vel mutaverim tantum διασκεδάτη in διασκεδάτη τι, nempe ἡφασος.” p. 60.

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS corrected.

“ Morbo Paterculus laborare videtur ii. 7.—‘ Factum Opimii, quod inimicitarum quæsita erat ultio, minor sequita auctoritas : et visa ultio privato odio magis quam publicæ vindictæ data.’ Ingrata voci, ultio repetitio merito displicuit doctis interpretibus ; sed locum non faciliter tentaverunt. Evidem, nescio an felicius, conjicio *ultio* post *visa* esse glossema, delendumque. Glossator metuebat ne quis *viva* referret ad *auctoritas*, et adposito *ultio*, errori cavebat ; sed ipsa sedulitas auctori nocuit, et glossema textum invasit.” p. 62.

DEMOSTHENES *De Cor.*

In p. 64. Tiberius, quoting the celebrated passage of Demosthenes, has, ‘Εσπάρα μὲν γὰρ ἥξη, whereas in the editions of Demosthenes we have ἦ. This variation has escaped the notice of Professor B.

εἰλίχεσαν, πεποιήκεσαν, etc.

“ Theodorus p. 88. f. πρὸς γε μὴ τὰς νόσους : et p. 86. τίως γε μην οἴρην εἰλίχεσαν κολοβόν. Ad vocem εἰλίχεσαν adipictum sic, dubitationem editoris celeberrimi indicare videtur. Sed in hoc scriptore talis forma ferenda est. Etenim tunc temporis tercia plurali plusquam perfecti

Attici persona utebantur, loco perfecti vel aoristi. Tzetzes initio commentarii in Iliadem habet ἵπποχειρίκοσαν, πεφροτίκοσαν, πεποίκοσαν, non alio modo posita." p. 67, 68.

Curious Latin Inscription.

In p. 69. M. B. quotes from the "Auctores Itineris literarii duorum Monachorum D. Benedicti" T. I. p. 301. an Inscription, which deserves a place in our Miscellany :

HOSPES, QUID SIM, VIDES.

QUID FUERIM, NOSTI.

FUTURUS IPSE QUID SIS, COGITA."

DEMOSTHENES corrected.

"Exord. Olynth. I. Αὐτὶ πολλῶν ἀν, ἡ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, χειμάστων ὑμᾶς ἐλίσθαι νοεῖται, εἰ φανερὸν γένοιτο τὸ μέλλον συνοίστιν τῇ πόλει. Sic vulgo distinguunt. Sed Dupinus, vir doctissimus, qui nuper Oratoris Olynthiacas fecit gallicas, commate posito post γένοιτο, non εἰ φανερὸν γένοιτο, sed τὸ μέλλον συνοίστιν a verbo ἐλίσθαι pendere notavit: quæ sententia omnino vera esse videtur, et commode firmari a Rufo, qui συνθέσον καὶ χειμάστα συγχρίνεται animadvertisit, non χειμάστα et τὸ φανερόν. Demosthenes qui hic ἐλίσθαι τὸ μέλλον συνοίστιν scribit, paucis interjectis dicit ἥδιαν τὴν τοῦ συνθέσοντος αἴρεσσιν γένοιται: et hoc Dupinianam interpretationem tuetur." p. 78, 79.

οἶκοσκος, domus avium.

In p. 89. of Rufus the famous words of Demosthenes occur, κανὲν ἐν οἰκίσκων τις αὐτὸν καθείρξεις τηρεῖ. We embrace this opportunity of telling our readers that the word οἰκίσκων, in the sense usually assigned to it in this place, occurs in the "Geponics," as edited by Niclas, that οἶκος is there so used more than once, and that *domus* is so used by Lucretius at the opening of the first book :

"Frondiferasque *domos avium*, camposque virentes."

ON THE WORD PALIMPSESTUS.

"IT is well known" (says a Reviewer of a Volume of *Fragments of Cicero*, lately printed at Milan) "that we have to ascribe the loss of many valuable works to a practice, which prevailed in the middle ages amongst the monkish scribes, who used to pare off the surface of parchment manuscripts, or to obliterate the ink by some chemical process, for the purpose of fitting them to receive the works of some Christian author. Copies of books thus prepared and written on a second time are called *Codices Palimpsesti*. It appears, from the account given by Wetstein of the *Codex Claromontanus* of the New Testament, that it had originally contained the works of some tragedian, perhaps Sophocles. A very ancient Galen was detected under the text of the New Testament by Knittel, in the library at Wol-

fenbuttel: for the erasure (*erasure*, Johnson) of the original writing was not always so complete, but that parts of it might be deciphered by holding it up to the light."

In a note on the word *Palimpsesti*, after quoting the two passages from Cicero and Catullus, referred to by Stephens, Gesner, Ainsworth, Cooper, Adams, and every other Latin or Greek Lexicographer, under the word *palimpsestus* or παλίμψητος, he proceeds; "In both which passages some read *palinresto*. Gloss. Vett. Παλίμψητρον *Deleticia*. Another has *Deleticia* Παλίμψητρον. To say the truth, I do not see by what analogy παλίμψητος is formed. It should rather be παλίμψητος."

I will show him by what analogy; and will give at full length in *gratiam lectoris* what is said on the subject by H. Stephens, under the word φάω; from whence by an easy process we come at ψηστός.

Ψηστός, οὐ, ὁ. *Tersus, Detersus*: vel *Rasus, Derasus*, aut *Raddendo detersus*. UNDE παλίμψητος, οὐ, ὁ καὶ ἡ, iterum *Derasus*, vel *Deradendo tersus*. Pro quo ET παλίψητος scriptum reperitur, omissus μ. Dicunturque tabellæ vel chartæ aut membranæ παλίμψητοι sive παλίψητοι, quæ secundo rasæ et detersæ sunt: ut deleta priore scriptura, nova possit inarari; quas Latini deletiaris chartas et membranas vocant, opposentes ei novam. Ut quum Ulpianus ait, *chartæ appellatio et ad novum chartam referunt et ad deletitium*. Plut. in fine libelli quem conscripsit περὶ τοῦ ὅτι μάλιστα τοῖς ὑγεμόσι δεῖ τὸν φελόποφον διαλέγεσθαι, de Platone loquens in Siciliam ad erudiendum Dionysium profecto, εὑρε Διονύσιον ὃσπερ βιβλίον παλίψητον ἥδη μολυσμῶν ἀνάπλεων, καὶ τὴν βαφὴν οὐκ ἀνέντα τῆς τυραννίδος, ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ δευτοποιὸν οὖσαν. Idem in lib. περὶ ἄδολεσχίας, non ita procul ab initio, οἱ δὲ ἀποκνιασούσι δήποτε τὰ ὡτα ταῖς ταυτολογίαις, ὃσπερ παλίψητα διαμολύνοντες. Latini etiam *palimpsesti* voce utuntur, ut Cie. ad Trebat. lib. 7. Epist. 18. "Nam quod in palimpsesto, (s. literas dedens) laudo equidem parsimoniam: sed miror quid in illa chartula fuerit quod delere malueris, nisi forte tuas formulas; non enim puto te meas epistolæ delere ut reponas tuas. An hoc significas, nihil fieri, frigere te, ne chartam quidem tibi suppeditare!" Ubi satis apertè ostendit, palimpsesti nomine se accipere chartam deletitiam: hoc est, in qua, deleta priore scriptura, repónitur alia: Sic Catullus epigr. 19. (20) ad Varum de Suffeno quodam, "Idemque longè plurimos facit versus. Puto esse ego illi millia aut decim, aut plura Perscripta; nec sit, ut fit, in palimpsesto Relata: chartæ regiae, novi libri, Novi umbilici, lora rubra, membrana Directa plumbo, et pumice omnia æquata." Sed notandum est, in posteriore Plutarchi loco veterem codicem pro παλίψητα ΗΒΕΡΕ παλίμψητα, α φαιω; apud Catullum, quibusdam in exemplaribus legi *palinysto*, seu *palinresto*, ut quidam scribere malunt. Sunt porro duo illa ΣΩΜΡ. Παλίγεστος ΕΤ Παλίγεντος, ex verbis ξέω et ξώ, idem cum φάω significantibus, ημιρυτ Rado, Erado, Derado: sonatque παλίγεστος sive παλίγεντος Iterum *rasus, Derasus, Rasus et pumice æquatus*, nam ξέων et φάων ita significant radere seu eradere, ut simul τοῦ ὄμαλίζειν et æquandi seu complanandi habeant significationem aliquam, et præsertim si tabellam

scriptorium ψῆφον sive ξέων dicamus. Budaeus SCRIBIT Ηλιορέστος,
ut et Ηλιορέστος alii."

So wretched a Greek scholar was Robert Ainsworth that he actually proceeds to derive the word from πάλιν and ξέω.

1815.

A. F.

P. S. Mr. Elmsley in his notes on the Medea (v. 842.) has the following passage. " Multum ad nostrum locum illustrandum valet Phoenissarum locus a nemine, quod sciam, hic relatus. v. 838. τὰς Ἀγρούς τε λίρας ὑπὸ πύργος ἀνέστη διδύμων ποταμῶν, &c. Majori quidē³ jure Thebeæ διδύμων ποταμῶν πύργος (i. e. πόλις) appellantur, quād Athenæ iερῶν ποταμῶν πόλις propter parvum flumen Cephisum [nothing said about the Iessus], quod modo memoravit noster. Sed poetarum proprium est res exiguae dicendo amplificare." If Mr. E. will turn to p. 166. of our xth Vol. he will there find something on the subject.

CAMBRIDGE PRIZE POEM

FOR 1790.

ODE LATINA

NUMISMATE ANNUO DIGNATA

ET IN CURIA CANTABRIGIENSI RECITATA.

MARE LIBERUM.

Sic, quando vastum funditur in mare,
Parvas et intermisct aquas salo
 Rivus, profundo vix inacti
 Percipitur pelagi barathro;
Ut Musa nisu precipiti mea
 Fertur, pusillum flumen et ingenii
 Suum in capaci, liberique
 Laudibus Oceani recondit.
Quin æstuosum ne metuas mare,
Pimplea; inox et fontibus integris
 Gaudebis, et dulci Hippocrene,¹⁰ aut
 Castaliis potieris undis.
Felix, amicæ qui monitis piè
Fretus Minervæ, roboream ratem
 Construxit, effusoque primus
 Non timuit dare vela ponto.

¹ Metrum laborat. Penultima hujus vocis ubique legitur producta. Dicit Strabo, si bene memini, Ἰππωνεῖην. Ἐκρήτη τοῦ ἵππου (Dor. ἵππω) scilicet. Quia et Hesiodus habet Ἰππωνεῖην.

Ille et marini regna Dei nova	
Mortalibus subjicit, et æquoris	
Ærarium reclusit ingens,	
Auctor opum decorisque nostri. 20	
Videsne rivos Hermus ut aureos	
Fundit, politumque India ebur, sua	
Molles Sabæi thura mittunt,	
Balsamaque, et croceos odores :	
Cydoniorum intendimus arcuum	
Subtile robur ; Threiciis equis	
Insidimus, Phœniciique	
Regio honore nitemus ostri.	
Læti exterarum fructibus arborum	
Carptis ab umbrâ vescimur ; optimum	30
Uvæ liquorem Formianæ aut	
Nectarareum bibimus Falernum.	
Quin et feraci terra sinu capit	
Fovetque longinquæ genitalia	
Scimenta Methymnae ; recenti	
Induitur foliorum amictu,	
Et poma mirans non sua, Lesbicis	
Rubet racemis fraxinus insito	
Ut gaudet efflorere malo, et	
In platano pyra lata canent. 40	
Quid quas operis in penetralibus	
Alit perennes dvitias mare,	
Fœtuque Neptunum natantum	
In numero referam tumentem ?	
Quid vasta quanto corpore se invenit	
Cete ? revulsum credideris procul	
Montem avehi, radicibusve	
Ortygiam freta ferre ruptis.	
Quid delicatos Carpathii canam	
Scari sapores ? aut acipenserem	50
Laudatum, et extensi decorem	
Egregium spatiumque rhombi ?	
Quas ergo largâ fudit opes manu	
Omnes per undas Oceanus pater,	
Mæotis æquè vel remoti	
Divitiis potiantur Indi.	
Nec tu solutum marmoreis iter,	
Hispane, campis obtrue, non tua	
Regna arrogans, circumfluique	
Publica jura maris coercens : 60	

Victricibus firmata Britannia
 Si vellet armis,—sed modo vindicas
 Justos honores, liberique
 Asserit imperium profundi.

THOMAS G. TAYLOR,
Coll. SS. et Indiv. Trin. A. S. 1790.

ON THE PROSODY OF GREEK VERSE

AS CONNECTED WITH DIALECT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

THERE is a nice point in the Prosody of Greek verse as connected with dialect, to which I beg leave to call the attention of your critical readers.

In an *Essay on the Composition of the Greek Sapphic Ode* (*Class. Journ. No. IX.* p. 123.) it is doubted whether these words,
 $\varphi\alpha\iota\nu\tauαι \kappa\epsilon\iota\nu\omega\ i\sigma\kappa\lambda\eta\gamma\omega\ \dot{\epsilon}\mu\mu\epsilon\omega$,

can be considered as forming a legitimate line; when the fifth syllable is a long vowel *ad finem vocis*, supported by the *ictus*, but followed by an initial vowel in the next word. (Vide also *Class. Journ. No. XIII.* p. 163.)

The writer proceeds with greater positiveness in his next remark, thus:

"Of some other cases far more common in modern Sapphics, there is neither doubt nor difficulty; where, for instance, in the Trochaic movement, a long vowel or diphthong with an hiatus forms a short syllable.

"The following lines, therefore,

P. 103. $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \Sigma\theta\epsilon\nu\sigma\ \tau\omega\ \mu\alpha\chi\rho\delta\ \beta\iota\beta\alpha\omega$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \omega\mu\omega\omega$

P. 116. $\delta\epsilon\sigma\mu\omega\ \dot{\epsilon}\mu\pi\lambda\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\omega\ \chi\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon\varphi\omega\ \pi\lambda\alpha\eta\alpha\tau\alpha\omega$

and all other verses like these, Quintilius would bid you at once *incidi reddere*.

"The error lies in arguing or in seeming to argue from what obtains in daetylic to what is lawful in trochaic movement.

Iliad. 4. 88. $\Pi\alpha\eta\delta\alpha\omega\ \alpha\eta\tau\theta\epsilon\omega\ \delta\iota\zeta\eta\mu\epsilon\eta$, $\epsilon\pi\omega\ \dot{\epsilon}\phi\mu\omega\omega$ evidently affords no justification for a Sapphic line ending thus,

$\epsilon\pi\omega\ \epsilon\omega\omega$:

nor P. 450. $E\iota\pi\omega\ \dot{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\theta\epsilon\pi\epsilon\iota\omega\ \alpha\lambda\epsilon\zeta\alpha\omega\delta\omega\ \theta\epsilon\omega\iota\delta\epsilon\omega\omega$
 for one thus beginning: "Ος καὶ αἰχματῶν ταρίας κεραυνῶν."

Mr. Blomfield, on the other hand, in the *Museum Criticum*; No. 1. p. 6. has edited the fourth stanza of the ode of Sappho οἰς Ἀφροδίτα, in the following manner:

αἰπσα δὲ ἵστικοντο· τὸ δέ, ὃ μάλαιρα,
μειδίκσας ἀθανάτῳ προσώπῳ
ἥγεντο τοτε τὸν, τὸ πέπονθα, καὶ τοτε
δὴ τὸ κάλημι, —————

15

and with the following note on v. 15.

"ἅπειροι, omnes, quod Ionicum est."

If the change of text thus settled by Mr. Blomfield be received as correct, the two verses quoted above from the *Musa Caenobiensis*, pp. 108, 116, become instantly legitimate.

First of all, however, *meliior conditio possidentis* holds good in the critical court as well as in the judicial.

And secondly, in what sense is ἥγεντο Ionic, in which it is not Æolic also, at least as having free ingress into the Æolic verse of Sappho and Pindar? In πυλίων and πηληγάδων, πυλάων and Ἀτρεδῶν, we immediately recognise Ionic as distinguished from Æolic forms of the noun. But is it equally clear, that, as forms of the verb, ἥγεντο ever stood in that relation to ἥγεντο?

Lastly, perhaps, Mr. Blomfield, with all that vigilant acuteness for which we so justly admire him, was yet not aware, that if ἥγεντο may be questioned on the score of dialect, ἥγεντο so posited is at least as questionable on the score of metre.

I should apologise certainly for the minuteness of this discussion, were it not entwined with a subject of great annual interest to the young men of our University. When the Æolian lyre is awaked, the least tack, which fastens one of the strings, has its share of importance.

SIDNEYENSIS.

7th August, 1815.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

No. VII.

A Dictionary of Abbreviations would often prevent some strange mistakes. The following exhibits one of a curious nature. The words *Juliani cum Ægyptiis V. mil.* were, by the ignorance of a copyist, written at large, *Juliani cum Ægyptiis quinque militibus*. Thus the expression passed current, until a correct inquirer found that *mil.* was the abbreviation for *militibus*.¹

¹ We beg leave to refer our Correspondent to pp. 262 and 263 of Vol. VII. of the *Classical Journal*, where he will find the different abbreviations of *mille* and *miles*.—ED.

A more modern blunder may be here introduced. An officer, who wrote an account of an expedition against Tippoo Saib, gave his MS. to an eminent writer to polish into a style of greater elegance. The original had stated that a sickly regiment landed at Joanna, and received so much benefit from the air and vegetables of the island, that all had recovered except 2 or 3. In these numbers the *r* was so indistinct that it was overlooked, and the printed copy gravely informed the reader, that such was the salutary influence of the air and vegetables of the island, that all recovered except two hundred and three.

T. M.

OLYMPIC GAMES.—A MS. of Lucian, No. 2954, in the Royal Library in Paris, contains the following Scholium on the *Ρητόρων Αιδάσκαλος*, c. 9. which fixes the date of the suppression of the Olympic Games :

Πόλις ἡνὶ ἐν Ἡλίδι Ὀλυμπίᾳ καλουμένῃ, ιερὸν ἔχουσα ἐπιφανέστατον Ὀλυμπίου Διός. Ἐν ταύτῃ ἀγώνι ἐπετελεῖτο παγκόσμιος, τὰ Ὀλύμπια, κατὰ πέντε ἔτη συγχροτούμενος· διὸ καὶ πενταετηρικὸς ἐκαλεῖτο, ὃς καὶ ἀνεγγάρφετο τοῖς δημοσίοις ἀεὶ, εἰς δήλωσιν τῶν ἐνιαυτῶν, καὶ ἦν τοῦτο ἀκριβῆς τοῦ χρόνου ἐπίγνωσις, τεσσάρων γαρ ἔτων μεταξὺ διαῤῥεοντων, τῷ πέμπτῳ συνετελεῖτο. Καὶ διήρχετον ἀρχέμενος ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐβραικῶν Κριτῶν μεχρὶ τοῦ μικροῦ Θεοδωσίου· ἐμπρησθέντος γαρ τοῦ ἐν Ὀλυμπίᾳ ναοῦ, ἐξέλιπε καὶ ἡ τῶν Ἡλείων πανήγυρις.

Latin TRANSLATION of SUIDAS.

Charles Stephens tells us, that the first Latin version of the Lexicon, which goes by the appellation of *Suidas*, was executed by *Robert Grossetest*, alias *Grosthead*; and, in the Latin form, *Capito*. This man was formerly Bishop of Lincoln, and died A. D. 1259.

Portus says nothing of this translation; nor Kuster, unless I am much mistaken, although I have him not by me.

If any of your correspondents can give information whether or not that work was ever printed, and, if not, whether there are any MSS. remaining of it, he shall be entitled to the thanks of

1815.

A. F.

Pontanus having made the following enigma on a *hole*,

Dic mihi quod majus fiat quo pluria demas,

riverius answered,

Pontano demas carmina, major erit.

Latin Verses supposed to have been written by Bishop Pearson.

JUSTA
EDOVARDO KING

naufrago,

ab

Amicis mōrentibus,

amoris

et

* * * * *

* * * * *

CANTABRIGIÆ.—1638.

- P. 14. TUTA peregrinis sospesque virescit ab armis,
 Nec timet externam terra Britannia manum ;
 Ambitus aequorei quippe irremeabilis alvei
 Difficiles aditus ambiguosque dedit :
 Dum brevia, et Syrtes, medioque latentia ponto
 Terrent ignotas naufraga saxa rates.
 Diis maris hoc, summae quibus est haec insula curae,
 Indulgent nostro praesidium imperio.
 Heu ! tameu his periit queis nos servamur in undis,
 Gloria Cantabrici non reparanda chorii.
 Mitte male impensas posthac persolvere grates
 Numinibus duris, terra Britannia, maris.
 Non hoc praesidium, non sunt ea munera tanti,
 Nec placet hac nobis conditione Salus.

JO. PEARSON. *

¹ Milton's Lycidas^{*} first appeared in this collection ; it is the last poem of the second part, which is entitled

“ Obsequies to
 the memorie
 of
 Mr. EDWARD
 KING,
 Anno Dom.
 1638.

* * * * *

² “ Joseph Pearson,”—T. Warton ; on what authority W. has not stated. He informs us, that “ the contributors were not all of Christ’s College;” J. Pearson was at that time Fellow of King’s College, and was collated by Bp. Davenant to the Prebend of Netherhaven, in the church of Sarum, in 1639.

* I have put down those variations which have not been noticed by T. Warton in his second edition of Milton’s occasional poems. It is to be regretted that the editors have not adhered more faithfully to the orthography of our great Bard ; it should not be wholly abandoned. With this, however, I have no concern.

1. inore ; 2. never-sere ; 4. rude ; 10. He well knew—in the margin of the copy, which appears from v. 157. to have been collated with subsequent editions ; 27. a-field ; 42. hasil-copse ; 51. Lord L. lov’d—in the margin ; 66. stridly ; 191. smites ; 175. oazie—oosie in margin ; 177, in the margin.

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS explained.

"Ammianus Marcellinus informs us of an observation, which Hormisdas, a Prince of Persia, made on Rome, and which is something remarkable, namely, *That one thing only had there pleased him—to find that men died at Rome as well as elsewhere.*

"Mr. Gibbon, in his History, has told us to read *displacuisse* for *placuisse*, 'displeased' for 'pleased'—a correction, to which those of Bentley are innocent. He says, the contrary sense would be that of a misanthrope, whereas his affords a reproof of Roman vanity.

"The sense that strikes me is very different from either of these, and is this, *that the Prince's envy at the pleasures of the inhabitants of Rome could only be moderated by the reflection that their pleasures were transitory.*

"How would the miserable envy the happy, were not the grave the equal termination of pleasure and of pain."—R. Heron's *Letters of Literature*, Lond. 1785, 8vo. p. 68.

3. Καὶ ἔλεγον πρὸς ἑαυτάς. Τίς ἀποκυλίσει ἡμῖν τὸν λίθον ἐκ τοῦ θύρας τοῦ μνημείου;

4. Καὶ ἀναβλέψασαι, θεωροῦσιν ὅτι ἀποκεκύλισται ὁ λίθος· ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα.—St. Mark's Gospel, chap. xvi.

5. "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?

4. "(And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away,) for it was very great."

I am disposed to believe that the latter part of the fourth verse (*ἦν γὰρ μέγας σφόδρα*) ought to have been placed at the end of the third, for the following reasons:—

1st. Because the greatness of the stone was the occasion of the question, "Who shall roll us away the stone?"

2ndly. Because the connective particle *γὰρ* now stands perfectly useless, but with the alteration proposed, it will have a reference to the preceding question.

3rdly. Because the common English version tacitly acknowledges the propriety of my emendation, in an endeavour, by a most awkward parenthesis, to connect the words, which have been hitherto separated, with their proper subject.

The Translation may then be read thus:

3. "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre? for it was very great.

4. "And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away;

5. "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw," &c.

'Ακούσας ὁ Σεύθης τὴν φωνὴν, ἡρώτα τὸν οἰνοχόον τί λέγοι. 'Ο δὲ οἰνοχόος εἶπεν 'Ελληνίζειν γάρ ἤπιστατο. 'Ενταῦθα μὲν ἥδη γέλως ἐγένετο.—Xenophon's Anabasis, Book VIith. Hutchinson's Ed. 4to. p. 550.

"When Seuthes heard him speak, he asked the cup-bearer what he said, who told him, for he could speak Greek: upon this there was a great laughing."—Spelman's Translation.

In my opinion, the passage ought to stand thus:

'Ακούσας ὁ Σεύθης τὴν φωνὴν, ἡρώτα τὸν οἰνοχόον τί λέγοι· ἐλληνίζειν γάρ ἤπιστατο. 'Ο δὲ οἰνοχόος εἶπεν 'Ενταῦθα μὲν ἥδη γέλως ἐγένετο.

1st. Because the real sense seems to require it; for it is more natural to suppose that Seuthes, knowing that his cup-bearer understood Greek, should ask him what was said, which occasioned the mirth; than that Seuthes, without knowing whether his cup-bearer understood Greek or not, should accidentally apply to him, and that he, by good luck, should understand Greek.

2ndly. Because the word οἰνοχόος so immediately follows οἰνοχόον, that any pronoun or relative would have sufficiently answered the purpose, instead of a repetition of the same word.

Translation.

"When Seuthes heard him speak, he asked the cup-bearer what he said; for he understood Greek: the cup-bearer then told him; upon this, there was immediately a great laughing." J. W.

EURIPIDES *Emendatus.*

In Eurip. Orest. 606. *voces δοῦναι δίκην reddit Porsonus jus dare vel reddere, usu, ait ille, rarissimo; totumque locum sic distinguit.* Μολὼν γὰρ εἰς ἔκκλητον Ἀργείων ὄχλου, Ἐκοῦσαν, οὐκ ἀκούσαν ἐπισείσω πόλιν, Σοὶ σῇ τ' ἀδελφῇ λευσιμον δοῦναι δίκην. Ut amoveatur id quod, apud bona notae Scriptores, pānē nūncupavēram solēcismum, ad hunc potius modum distinxerim. Μολὼν γὰρ εἰς ἔκκλητον Ἀργείων ὄχλου, Ἐκοῦσαν, οὐκ ἀκούσαν, ἐπισείσω πόλιν Σοὶ σῇ τ' ἀδελφῇ, λευσιμον δοῦναι δίκην. Quin et sic verterim; *Ubi enim per ventum sit ad convocationem Argivorum turbam, Volentem, minime invitum, urbem commoverebo In te tuamque sororem, ita ut pānam pendatis lapidatione.* Exemplum verbi ἐπισείσω cum dativo, ut dicunt grammatici, personæ suppeditabit ejusdem fabule, v. 249. *Il μητέρ, ἵκετεύω σε, μὴ πτίσει μοι Τὰς αἰματωποὺς καὶ δρακοντώδεις χόρας.* Alexis Comicus apud Athenaeum VIII. p. 339. citante Porsono. *Ω μητέρ, ἵκετεύω σε, μὴ πτίσει μοι Τὸν Μισγόλαν.* Ceterum haudquaquam aliter intellexit Scholiasta; cujus verba sunt bene interpretem agentis, κατὰ σοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀδελφῆς, ὥστε δοῦναι ὑμᾶς δίκην διὰ λίθων.

On the translation of the Iliad into French, by Madame Dacier, whose name was Le Fevre :

'Ιλιάδ' ἡ Φαβερὴ Κελτοῖσιν ἔδωκεν· ἀληθὲς
Νῦν Πηληϊάδεω μῆνιν ἀεισε Θεά.

Groot, the name of Grotius, signifies *Great* in the Flemish language. Hence Vossius, speaking of that celebrated character, says that he was *re et nomine Magnus*.

Mary, Queen of Scots, wrote on a pane of glass, at an Inn, in Buxton :

Buxtona, quæ tepidæ celerabere numine lymphæ,
Buxtona, forte iterum non adeunda, vale!

The Poet Lainez, who died in 1710, spent all the morning in study, and all the evening at table ; hence he said of himself—

Regnat nocte calix, volvuntur biblia mane :
Cum Phœbo Bacchus dividit imperium.

De voce Βούχερος.

AN, quod probabile est ex accentu, veteres Græci dixerunt βούχερος, a veteri nominativo κέρος (vide Pors. Praef. ad Hecub. p. ix.), seriores βούχερως, ideoque in Choricis, saltem Aeschyleis, vetus forma reponenda est ? In Odyss. K. 158. varia lectio ύψιχερον præbet pro vulgatâ ύψιχερων. *Class. Journ. Vol. XI. p. 65.*

Hanc meam conjecturam firmat vox Latina *bucerus*, quod antea prætermiseram. Vide Lucret. v. 864. vi. 1240. Ovid. Met. vi. 395.

1815.

N. A.

ÆNIGMATA.

1. Mitto tibi Navem prora puppique carentem.
2. Si quid dat pars prima mei, pars altera rodit.
3. Nil erimus, totas si vis existere partes :
Omnia, scinde caput, lector amice, sumus.
4. Quem mea præteritis habuerunt moenia seclis
Vatem, si vertas, hoc modo nomen habent.
5. Primum tolle pedem, tibi fient omnia fausta ;
Inversum, quid sim dicere nemo potest.

6. Sume caput, curram ; ventrem conjunge, volabo ;
 Adde pedes, comedes ; et sine ventre bibes.
7. Cortice sub gelido reserant mea viscera flammam.
 A capite ad calcem resecare ex ordine membra
 Si libeat, varias assumam ex ordine formas :
 Spissa viatori jam nunc protenditur umbra ;
 Nunc defendo bonos, et amo terrere nocentes ;
 Mox intrare veto ; sum denus denique et unus.
 Unica si desit mihi cauda, silere jubebo.

The inhuman Catherine de Medicis was terrified at the sight of a Comet, which appeared at the time of the League. To that circumstance the following verses allude :

Spargeret horrendas cum tristis in æthere crines,
 Venturique daret signa Cometa mali,
Ecce suæ Regina timens male conscientia vitæ
 Credidit invisum poscere fata caput.
Quid, Regina, times ? namque hæc mala si qua minantur,
 Longa timenda tua est, non tua vita brevis.

That we have no characters to express the sounds of the French J, U, or final N, is an assertion of Mitford, History of Greece, c. ii. s. 3. He might have added the French A, and other sounds; but he probably meant that we have no similar sound in English to J, U, or the nasal N. This is accurate only with respect to U; for we have the sound of J in our S in the words *measure, pleasure*, &c. and we have the nasal sound in can't, won't, &c. The *l mouillée* is generally thought difficult of pronunciation to those, who do not recollect that we have the same sound in such words as *billiards*.

MOTS OU OMIS PAR H. ETIENNE,

Ou inexactement expliqués.

Par J. B. GAIL, Lecteur et Professeur Royal, de l'Institut de France.

1. ἀνωσαι. (Thucyd. 8. 93. 2.) H. Etienne (t. iv. p. 766. c.) traduit ἀνωσαι τὴν πόλιν, *urbem hostibus objectare* : c'est ne rendre ni le sens de ἀνω, ni celui de ὥσαι. Æmilius Portus en donne pour glose,

ἀναρπατεῖσαν est τὰς τῶν πολεμίων χεῖρας ἐμβάλλειν : je l'adopterois à l'exception d'*ἐμβάλλειν*, qui me paroît faible ; tandisque le grec *ώσαι* bien plus énergique, signifie, *urbem protrudere* : ce qui donne l'idée de force et de violence mieux que *ἐμβάλλειν*. Je proposerois donc : *rempublicam pessum abeuntem ac interversam in manus hostium protrudere*. Notez que *ἄνα* ou *ἄνω* renfermé dans *ἄνωσαι* dépend, non de *ώσαι* exprimé, mais d'un verbe sousentendu, tel que *τραπεῖσαν*.

Je pourrois citer quantité de verbes dont la préposition dépend de même qu'on du verbe auquel elle est jointe, mais d'un verbe sousentendu : donnons en deux exemples : διέπεμψαν, pour διαμερίσαντες ἐπεμψαν, (Thucyd. 4. §. 1.) ἐκπλεῦσαι, pour πλεῦσαι ἐκφυγόντες : (Thucyd. 8. 102. 1.) le 8eme livre de Thucydide, que quelques Savans balancent, bien à tort, à attribuer à cet historien, nous fournira beaucoup de locutions aussi remarquables.

2. *ἀνδράτοδον*, vient, nous disent les lexicographes, de *ἀνήρ* et de *πούς, ποδός*. Mais c'est prendre pour désinence ce qui tient au radical. Car le dernier *a* de *ἀνδρα* n'est nullement désinence de ce mot : il appartient évidemment à l'*a* d'*ἀποδόν*. L'analogie et un passage formel de Pausanias prouvent incontestablement que la véritable étymologie est *ἀνήρ* et *ἀποδόν*, *hominem verdeo*. Voy. l'article *ἱμφάρματος*.

3. *ἀσφαλῶς δονλεύειν*, Thuc. 2. 63. 2. H. Etienne, t. iii. p. 1172. H. cite *ἀσφαλῶς τηρεῖν diligenter custodire*. Mais au lieu de cet exemple, ou, si l'on veut, à la suite de cet exemple facile, il convenoit d'en citer un bien autrement difficile. C'est *ἀσφαλῶς δονλεύειν* de Thuc. 2. 63. 2. *le repos*, dit Periclès, *ne se conserve que combiné avec l'activité*, et il ajoute : *le repos est bon, non dans une ville qui commande, mais dans une ville qui obéit ; et cela pour être assujetti avec moins de danger*, c. à d. *pour rendre son esclavage moins dangereux ; ut secura serviat*. La version de mes devanciers, *neque civitati principatum obtinenti, sed subditæ, quietam securamque agere servitatem conducit*, est évidemment fautive. voy. 1^o la version latine de mon Thucydide ; 2^o mon mémoire sur Thucyd. 3^o mon *Démosthène pro coronâ* pag. 145, 146. Démosthène a emprunté, entre tant d'autres, cette locution à Thucydide.

4. *ἀξίωσις, ἀξίωμα*, Thuc. 2. 37. 1. l'illustre Henri Etienne qui paroît trop souvent étranger à l'analogie, dit *ἀξίωσις idem quod ἀξίωμα*. Pour moi, je propose de dire : *ἀξίωσις, l'action de prétendre, postulation* ; et non pas *postulatum* comme je l'ai dit à tort ; *ἀξίωμα le résultat des prétensions, la dignité, dignités*. voy. mes essais sur les désinences 2. partie, p. 13. sq. j'essaye d'y prouver que les noms en *σις* expriment en général *l'action de*, et ceux en *μα* *l'objet d'action* : que dans toutes les désinences Grecques, Latines, Françaises, en *ma me*, la lettre *m* paroît servir à exprimer *cumulation, agglomération, consistance, solidité, majesté, grandeur* ; que sur le sens de *ἀξίωσις, ἀξούσιος, ἀκόντιος, διάγνωσις, ἐπιτήδευσις, τείχιος*, lesquels diffe-

rent de ἀξιωμα, ἀξονομα, ἀκεσμα, ἀκόντισμα, διαγνώμη, ἐπιτήδευμα, *reίχωμα*, et sur tant d'autres H. Etienne, Cattier, Abresch, Bauer, Ducker, et avant eux Budée, Thomas Magister, et Denys d'Halicarnasse lui-même se sont mépris.

5. *διαγνώσις discussion*; *διαγνώμη résultat de la discussion*. voy. mon Demosth. pro coronâ p. 120. et mes désinences 2. partie, p. 14.

6. *δειδήμορες*. (Hom. Il. β. 56.) H. Etienne le rend par *timidus, meticulosus*, et cite le v. 56. de l'Il. ἀλλὰ μάλα Τρῷες δειδήμορες; conformément à cette version d'Etienne, M. Bitaubé qualifie les Troyens de *timides*, et un autre de *lâches*. Homere qui 3. 36. et *passim* les appelle ἄγερώχων et 3. 131. *ἰπποδάμων*, a-t-il bien eu la pensée de traiter les Troyens de lâches, et de mettre cette épithète dans la bouche d'un héros Troyen qui eût ainsi insulté sa nation. Je ne puis me le persuader. Je crois donc que la paraphrase du vers est: *les Troyens sont trop respectueux pour un des fils de leur roi, nimis verecundi*. Cependant le respect ne va pas sans un certain sentiment de crainte. Dans l'Iliade, chant 3. 172. et ch. 24. 435. ces 2 sentiments sont exprimés et réunis dans un seul et même vers. Voy. mon Thucyd. t. 9. p. 122. et mes obs. sur Thucyd. p. 78. sq.

7. *ἐγέρσιμος ὑπνος*. H. Est. traduit d'après Nonnus, *somnus è quo aliquis excitari potest*. Fortifions son exemple d'un vers de Théocrite non compris (id. 24. 7.) c'est *ἐγέρσιμον ὑπνον*, qui signifie non pas *un sommeil suivi d'un doux reveil*, comme le veut M. Geoffroy, mais *un sommeil suivi de réveil, un sommeil qui ne soit pas celui de la mort*: idée pleine de sensibilité, qui fait allusion au danger qu'avoit couru le fils d'Alemène de dormir sans s'éveiller jamais.

8. *ἐσβασις*, (Thuc. 7, 30, 1 et 2.) mot composé, omis par H. Etienne, Robertson et autres lexicographes. Nous lisons dans Thucydide (I. I.) *ἐν τῇ ἐσβάσει*. On le traduit par *dum naves consenderent*, version admise par le savant M. Douka: mais je propose, *dum naves peterent*: version qu'ailleurs j'expliquerai logiquement.

9. *Θράκη* et *τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης*. H. Et. se fait sur *τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης*. On rendoit communément ces deux locutions par *la Thrace*; mais en refléchissant et sur le génie de la langue et sur des faits historiques que je développe dans un mémoire, je proposerois *la Thrace*, au premier; et *l'épi-thrace* ou *villes épithraces*, au second: dénomination qui indiqueroit les colonies Grecques établies sur la mer Egée, depuis la presquile de la Pallène jusqu'à Byzance, et auxquelles les Athéniens, à une époque indiquée par Thucydide, (8, 64, 1.) donnerent un gouverneur; ce que notre historien n'annonce pas comme une création de place. Un helléniste François fort habile ne partage point mon

opinion, et traduit τὰ ἐπὶ θράκης par *les pays de la Thrace*; ou *les affaires de la Thrace*: version conforme à celle de l'interprète Latin qui donne *ad obcundas res Thraciae*, tandisque Hudson le rend par *in Thraciam pergens*. Mais je crois tous les deux fautifs. Un mémoire que j'ai composé sur ce point de critique grammaticale et géographique, peut seul apporter la conviction.

10. κότος. Selon Etienne, d'après Eustathe, κότος se met simplement pour χόλος. Eustathe parloit-il ainsi d'après ce vers où Homère (Il. 13, 220.) dans son admirable portrait d'Ulysse, dit qu'il étoit ζάκοτος. On le traduit par *iracundum*. Mais dira t-on d'un *iracundus*, ce que dit Homère de son Ulysse, στάσκειν, ἵπατε δὲ ἴδεσκε καὶ Χθοὺς ὄμματα πίγκας. Αστεμφές, &c.? Non certes. Rejettons donc le *furiousum* de Politus, l'*iracundum* de l'illustre M. Heyne. Ces épithètes supposent une colère qui se manifeste par une agitation extérieure. Or l'Ulysse d'Homère, loin de se laisser aller à des mouvements violents, à une agitation extérieure, concentre sa colère : il tient son sceptre immobile, il a le regard louche, et la figure d'un imbecille (ἄφρονα, Il. 3, 220.) Ζάκοτος se dira d'un homme qui couve un profond ressentiment. Quant à κότος, il ne peut être synonyme de χόλος. Homère lui même résutera Eustathe dans ces vers : (Il. i. 81, 82.) *Lorsqu'un roi en veut à quelqu'un, il peut bien, un moment, arrêter les transports de sa colère, (χόλον) mais le ressentiment (κότον) n'habite pas moins dans son ame, jusqu'à ce qu'il lui ait donné tout son effet.* Voy. κοτέοντε, Il. 3, 345, κότος, (Il. 13, 416) avec le sens de *ressentiment*; et χόλος, avec l'acception de *colère*, Il. i. 224; i. 387; vi. 23; x. 106, 107.

11. πάνδοκος. (Pindare Ol. 3, 30.) H. Etienne traduit *qui quemlibet hospitio excipit; omnes capiens*. Pindare emploie ce mot en parlant de l'Hiéron, ou enceinte sacrée de l'Olympie. Cet Hiéron ayant presque l'étendue d'une cité, n'est-il pas probable que πάνδοκος signifie *omnia capiente*, plutôt que *omnes accipiente*? *l'Hiéron qui embrasse tout, pour qui embrasse tant d'objets précieux, où se livrent tant de combats fameux, &c. &c.* n'est-il pas préférable à l'Hiéron hospitalier de l'illustre M. Heyne, ou à *l'Hiéron qui héberge tout le monde d'un autre savant?* L'analogie ne le dit-elle pas? Pour avoir *omnes capiente*, πάντα eût été, je crois, nécessaire dans la formation du composé: n'ayant que πᾶν, je traduirois par *omne*, et non par *omnes*. Dans cet article, j'ai dit l'Olympie, pour le territoire d'Olympie; car je n'admetts pas de ville d'Olympie. Il n'a manqué à cette prétendue ville si fameuse que d'avoir existé. Voyez *l'index critique de l'atlas géographique de mon Xénophon grec-français Latin*, dix Vol. in 4to.

12. πεδιὰς, ἀδος, ᷦ. H. Etienne, au mot πεδιὸς traduit le subst. par *planities*, comme πεδίον. Mais ces deux mots diffèrent: πεδίον sign. plaine; πεδιὰς *vaste et immense plaine*. Voy. 1^o. *mes essais sur les désinences*. obs. prélim. p. xvi.; 2^o. *mes idiotismes grecs*, 2^{de} edit. p. 208.

13. *προσφθεγκτὸς φωνῆς* 68. Sophocles Philoct. v. 1096, edit. de Vauvil. donne trois mots : le Schol. donne pour glose *προσφωνθῆναι ἄξιος*. Brunck la répète. Au lieu de la juger fautive, H. Etienne donne *προσφθεγκτικὸς* au lieu de *προσφθεγκτός*, (mécounoissant ainsi les principes des désinences ; car il existe une grande différence entre les désinences *tos* et *κτικός*) puis cite la glosse. L'ingénieux mais souvent trop hardi Wakefield propose de substituer *φωνὴ* à *φωνῆς*. Pour moi, je proposerois 1^o. de réintégrer dans H. Et. *προσφθεγκτὸς* qu'il a omis ; 2^o. de traduire *ayant l'oreille frappée de la voix de toi* ; et plus litt. *frappé par le son de la voix de toi* (*φωνῆς* régi par *πρός*). J'ajouterois enfin que désormais dans les lexiques, *προσφθεγκτός* ne doit pas être cité sans être suivi de *σοῦ φωνῆς* qui est comme l'appendice de *προσφθεγκτός*.

14. *ρύμφαρματος*. (Sophocle, OEd. c. 1117. edit. Vauvil.) H. Etienne omet ce mot. Robertson, lexicographe soigné, le donne ainsi que le mot précédent, et le traduit par *qui celeriter curru fertur* ; version adoptée par un de nos savans qui le rend par *porté rapidement sur un char*, *qui fait voler son char avec rapidité*. Cette version est-elle bonne ? je ne le crois pas. Sur quoi fonde t-il l'acception, *porté sur un char* ? Sur la désinence souvent passive *tos* : mais dans *tos* le *r* appartient, non à la désinence mais au radical *ρύμψ*. En reflétrissant donc sur les principes des désinences, je dirois que *ρύμφαρμάτος* joint à *ἀμίλλας* (Soph. OEd. c. 1117, 1118.) signifie *chars rapides*. La version de *curulibus præliis* vaut mieux que celle de *curribus* de Brunck, qui en la donnant devoit bien, dans ses notes, présenter un Supplément à cette version. *ἀμίλλας ρύμφ.* de l'OEd. c. me rappelle l'*ἀμίλλας χαλαργοῖς* de l'Electre (867) du même tragique. Le premier des deux mots composés montre le char ; le second, les coursiers.

15. *στεύδω τὴν ἡγεμονίαν, ad principatum proprio*. D'après cette version de H. Etienne, voilà deux généreux citoyens transformés en vils intrigants. voy. mes obs. sur *Thucydide*, 5, 16, 1.

16. *συνθνήσκειν*. H. Etienne l'admet et cite Sophocle qui l'emploie dans son Philoct. v. 1488. mais comme les plus grands critiques, ne le comprenant pas, l'ont corrigé ; licence que je combats dans mon Philoctete, expliquons le vers que cite, sans l'expliquer, H. Etienne : *car la piété (συνθνήσκει) transmigre avec les mortels religieux, avec eux trépasse, avec eux va dans l'autre vie, avec eux se rejоint aux dieux.*

En terminant cet article, permettez, Monsieur le Redacteur, que j'aye l'honneur d'annoncer à vos compatriotes mon Thucydide Grec, Franç. Latin, que j'ai souvent cité dans les précédentes explications.¹

¹ On s'empresse d'y porter l'attention des lecteurs du Journal dans le Prospectus du Xénophon du savant auteur, p. 227.—Ed.

Literary Intelligence.

A Corrected Catalogue of the late Mr. Lunn's books ; with the prices affixed ; for ready money. Price 3s.

We cannot refrain from recording the following *Biographical Mémoir* of Mr. L. written by that illustrious scholar, Dr. Park, whose actions are always foremost in the cause of humanity ; and prefixed to the Catalogue.

" Mr. Lunn resided as a Bookseller at Cambridge for ten years. In March 1797 he came to London, and succeeded Mr. Samuel Hayes in Oxford Street. On his removal into Soho Square in 1801, he, by the advice of Scholars and with the approbation of friends, established the CLASSICAL LIBRARY upon a new and extensive plan. His views were announced in a perspicuous and even elegant Advertisement, in which, with a tone of thinking far raised above the narrow and selfish views of a mind intent only upon profit, he endeavoured to interest in his own favor such persons, as habitually look with veneration to the memory of Bentley, to the erudition of Hemsterhuis, and his illustrious School, and to the sagacity, taste, and learning of our celebrated countryman, Richard Porson.

" Other Booksellers had been accustomed to provide for purchasers publications in the modern, as well as the ancient languages : Mr. Lunn resolved to act up faithfully and rigorously to the name, which he had chosen for his own collection. He immediately entered into various and important negotiations with Booksellers upon the continent. He confined his attention to such Works, as were interesting to Scholars only. But, in order to supply their demands, he took a wide and varied range. With an activity, and perhaps we may add, magnanimity, which men of learning cannot fail to applaud, he ventured to bring together many *Principes Editiones*. He did not shrink from the purchase of other editions, expensive from their bulk, their splendor, or their rarity. He amassed large numbers of the *Delphinus Editions*, and of those, which are called *Variorum*. He was upon the watch to procure new editions of classical works published by foreign Scholars of his own time, and he took the most judicious measures for obtaining them early. To critical and philological Books he was peculiarly attentive ; and whether we consider the number or the usefulness of those, which the CLASSICAL LIBRARY supplied, we cannot wonder that the zeal and the judgment of Mr. Lunn in collecting them attracted the notice of the curious, and the favor of the learned.

" The ardor of his mind induced him to take a large share in valuable and costly publications from the presses of Cambridge, Oxford, Edinburgh, Glasgow, and London. The cost of reprinting Broter's Tacitus under the superintendance of Mr. Valpy fell upon

Mr. Lunn only. Among other Works, in which he was concerned with respectable men of the trade, *Wakefield's Lucretius*, *Ernesti's Cicero*, *Drakenborch's Livy*, *Schleusner's Lexicon*, *Morell's Thesaurus*, improved and enlarged by Dr. Maltby, and *Scapula's Lexicon*, deserve to be enumerated. He had engaged to take several copies of the *Herodotus*, which is now preparing for the press by Professor Schweighaeuser; and in consequence of the connexions, which he had gradually formed with the literati of this kingdom, he so far deviated from his original design, as to undertake the publication of a few Tracts in the Oriental Languages.

" His vigilance and integrity were manifested in the good condition of his Books; and perhaps we have to commend his munificence, rather than his discretion, in the fondness which he occasionally indulged for costly bindings. His pride indeed was gratified by the consciousness of pursuing such measures, as were alike agreeable to the opulent collector and the profound scholar.

" The fortune, which Mr. Lunn inherited from his Father, was very inconsiderable. On his first settlement in London, a part of the property bequeathed to him ultimately by his Uncle, Mr. R. Labutte, a French Teacher in the University of Cambridge, and amounting nearly to 10,000*l.*, came into his possession, and enabled him doubtless for some time to carry on with effect the concerns of the CLASSICAL LIBRARY. For this advantage he was indebted to the kindness of an Aunt, whose confidence in his honesty, and whose solicitude for his welfare, induced her to give up during her life a portion of that money, which by the Will of the Uncle was to descend to Mr. Lunn at her decease. Observing the importance of this concession in facilitating the success of Mr. Lunn, this excellent Woman was afterwards led, from the same motives of kindness, to transfer for his use the remainder before the month of January 1808, when she died. In the growing prosperity of Mr. Lunn, in his probity, and his gratitude she received the just reward of her unfeigned and disinterested friendship.

" The whole of Mr. Lunn's property was embarked in his trade, and under circumstances more favorable his accumulation must have been rapid. But he had to struggle with unusual and most stubborn difficulties. Insurances were high—Goods were often delayed, for which Mr. Lunn had been obliged to pay before they reached him—The course of exchange ran for many years against England, and the loss, which Mr. Lunn sustained from this cause on the amount of the invoices, was sometimes 20, sometimes 25, and sometimes even 30 per cent. The sale of books, procured under these unavoidable and irremediable disadvantages, was in many instances slow and precarious. Mr. Lunn, like every other Bookseller, was doomed to losses from the inability of his employers to make their payments. He dealt with men, whose rank, whose delicacy, and upon some occasions whose poverty protected them from that importunity, with which the generality of tradesmen enforce their claims. He rarely expected immediate payment—he never demanded it—he allowed for it a reasonable discount—and in the mean time, for the support of his credit both at home and abroad;

he was compelled to fulfil his own engagements without deduction and without delay.

" We have now to record the chief cause of those embarrassments, which disturbed his spirits, and shortened his existence. The return of peace, by opening a free communication with the Continent, was beneficial to other traders, but most injurious to Mr. Lunn. They accumulated their stock without the numerous impediments, which Mr. Lunn had encountered. They were exempt from many of those restrictions upon importation, to which Mr. Lunn had for many years been obliged to submit. They were able to buy, and therefore to sell, at a cheap rate those articles, for which Mr. Lunn had previously paid to foreigners a very high price. They purchased after a favorable alteration in the course of exchange, and with considerable diminution in charges for insurance.

" Disappointed in his expectations—alarmed at the prospect of impending losses—perplexed by the application of creditors, whose demands he had frequently satisfied with exemplary punctuality—conscious of having exhausted the whole of his property in procuring ~~him~~, some of which he might be obliged to sell at a less price than that, which he had advanced for them—unaccustomed to propitiate the severe by supplication, to trick the artful by evasion, and to distress the friendly by delay, he was suddenly bereaved of that self-command, which, if he could have preserved it, would eventually have secured for him unsullied respectability, undiminished prosperity, and undisturbed tranquillity. But in the poignant anguish of his soul delicacy prevailed over reason, and panic over fortitude—Every expedient proposed by his faithful and affectionate advisers was at one moment adopted with gratitude, and at the next rejected with phrenzy—Every present inconvenience was magnified into an insurmountable obstacle—Every possible future mischance was anticipated as an inevitable and ruinous calamity—To his disordered imagination retreat seemed impracticable—To his unaltered and unalterable sense of honor resistance appeared unjustifiable—By his wounded pride submission was deemed alike ignominious and ineffectual—He reflected, and was impatient of reflection—he hoped, and was ashamed of hope—he approved, and disapproved—he decided, and hesitated—he despaired, and perished.

" Happily for the human race, all the extenuations, which accompany such cases, are reserved for the tribunal of that Being, who knoweth of what we are made, and remembereth that we are but dust. In the mean time many a Christian will be disposed to commiserate the circumstances of Mr. Lunn's death, and many a man of letters may find reason to deplore the loss of his well meant, and well directed labors.

" Unfortunately Mrs. Lunn and her daughters have not the means of continuing the business, in which Mr. Lunn was engaged. Their doom is to lament an affectionate husband and an indulgent father. Their only resources lie in the exertions of their friends, and in the good will of every wise and every virtuous man, who contemplates the

acuteness of their sufferings, and who from experience can appreciate the worth of their nearest relative, and most beloved protector.

" For the satisfaction of such persons enough has been already stated, and to others, who are seldom inclined to pardon human frailties, or to pity human woes, more would be urged in vain.

" It remains for us more directly to lay open the purposes, for which the Catalogue is intended, and the principle, by which it was regulated.

" The debts of Mr. Lunn amount to eight thousand pounds. The worth of the property, which he has left behind him, is supposed to exceed that sum. His Executor is anxious to discharge those debts by the speedy sale of his effects, and to employ the surplus in making provision for Mrs. Lunn, and her two daughters. In order to facilitate the sale of the stock in Soho-Square, the price of every common and every choice article has been considerably reduced, and every possible encouragement has been given for literary men to partake of the various and precious treasures offered to them. It cannot often happen that books so valuable will be presented to their choice at so moderate a price. It may never be in their power again to gratify at once their curiosity, and their benevolence. They are respectfully invited to mark the good opinion which they formerly entertained of Mr. Lunn himself for skilfulness in his profession, and probity in his dealings. They are earnestly entreated to manifest their good will to a family, deprived of his protection, mourning for his death, and depending upon the successful sale of his books and other property as the only expedient, which can procure for them the necessary comforts and reasonable conveniences of life.

" SAMUEL PARR, LL.D.

" THOMAS KIDD, A.M. Trin. Coll. Cam.

" EDMUND HENRY BARKER, Trin. Coll. Camb.

" ROBERT MASTERS KERRISON, New Burlington St.

" THOMAS EDWARDS, Executor, Soho Square."

The catalogue of the books published at the Leipzig Easter fair 1815, having just arrived, we extract for the use of our readers the titles of the principal works on Classical and Biblical Criticism. Catalogues have been procured by Bohte, York Street, Covent Garden, who also has imported many of the books contained in the annexed list.

Acta philologorum Monacensium, edid. Fr. Thiersch. 8vo. Monachii. 1815.

Aristophanis Comœd. edidit Phil. Invernizzio. Tom. VI. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Æschinis et Demosthenis Orationes de Corona. Recensuit Im. Bekker. Accedunt Schol. Part. inedita 8vo. Halæ, 1815.

Æschinis Oratoris opera, ad fidem optim. libr. edita. 12. Lips. 1815.

Anonymi *Economica*, quæ vulgo Aristotelis falso ferebantur. **E**libris scriptis. et vers. antiqua emendavit J. G. Schneider, 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Antholog. Græc. ad fidem Cod. Parisini. ex apograph. Gothano. edidit. Jacobs. tom. II. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Apollonii Rhod. Argon. ad opt. libr. fidem accurate edit. 18. Lips. 1815. Benedicti T. F. Comment. Crit. in VIII. Thucydidis libros, 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Caparis Jul. Comment. de bello Gallico et Civili. 8vo. Marburg: 1814.

Ciceronis M. T. Orat. Philipp. 2da. übersetzt und mit einem nach Hand schriften berichtigten texte von M. G. G. Wernsdorf. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Ciceronis Op. ad fid. opt. libr. accurate edita tom. I—III. Rhetorica contin. 12. Lips. 1814.

——— Op. quæ supersunt omnia ac deperditor. fragm. cùm var. lectionis lect. edidit, C. G. Schütz. tom. III—VI. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

——— Histor. Philosoph. antiq. ed. F. Gedike. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

——— Trium Oratt. pro Scauro, pro Tullio, pro Flacco partes ineditæ, cum scholiis incd. recensuit et not. illustravit, P Mairus. 8vo. Francf. 1815.

Corpus historic. lat. cura F. E. Rähkopf. et J. D. Seebode. tom. V. Velleium Patrc. cont. 8vo. Hanov. 1815.

——— Tom. XV. p. 1. Sext. Rufum. cont. Ib.

Tom. XV. p. 2. S. Rusi de regionib. urb. Rom. libellus edidit et Comment. instruxit. G. Münich. Ib.

Eichhorn's J. G. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3 bds. 2te hälft. 8vo. Lips. 1814.

——— Die Weltgeschichte 2r. Theil. 3r. und. 4r. Bänd. 8vo. Göttingen. 1814.

Eichhorn's Literärgeschichte 2te hälft. 8vo. Göttingen, 1814.

Epistola D. Jacobi I. atque Petri I. cum versione germanica et commentar. lat. edidit J. J. Hottingerus 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Euripidis Tragœdiæ et fragmenta. cum scholiis gr. e codd. MSS. et versione Latina. Edidit Aug. Matthiæ. tom. III. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Frank O. Fragmente eines Versuchs über die dynamische Spracherzeugung nach Vergleichungen der Persischen, Indischen, und Tentschçen Sprachen und Mythen. 8vo. Nürnberg, 1815.

Freytag, G. W. F. carmen Arabicum perpetuo commentario, et versione iambica germanica illustratum. 8vo. Göttingen, 1815.

Friedrich, C. G. Symbolæ philologicocrit. et lectionis varieta-tem continentes ad interpretationem Psal. CX. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Gesenius, G. de Pentateuch. Samar. origine, indole, et auctori-
tate, commentatio. 4to. Halæ. 1815.

Kritische Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache und Schrift. 8vo.
Lips. 1815.

Geusau, A. von, Geschichte der Römischen und Griechischen
Kaiser, von Julius Cæsar bis Franz. II. mit ihren Vildnissen. 5 bde.
4to. Wien. 1814.

Griesbach's D. J. J. Vorlesungen über die Hermeneutik des N. T.
mit Anwendung auf die Leidens- und Auferstehungsgeschichte Christi.
Herausgeg. von I. C. S. Steiner. 8vo. Nürnberg. 1815.

Halbkart. C. G. Tentamina criseos in difficilioribus quæ usd.
auct. vet. et Græc. et Lat. locis. 8vo. Wratislav. 1813.

Haldersonii, Biorn. Lexicon Island. Lat. Danicum, edidit Ras-
kius. tom. II. 4to. Havniae. 1815.

Homeri Ilias, Gr. et Lat. cura J. G. Hageri tom. I. 8vo. Chem-
nitz. 1815.

Homer's Werke, übersetzt von J. H. Voss. 4 bde. 8vo. Tübing.
1814.

Horatii op. recensuit C. F. Döring. tom. I. 8vo. Tübing.

Jacobs, Fr. Elementarbuch der griechischen Sprache für Anf-
ger. ir. Thl. ir. u. Gr. cursus, 8vo. Jena 1815.

'Ισημβλήσου ἀλληγίεως περὶ βίου Πυθαγορίκου λογός. Iamblichus
Chalc. de vit. Pythagorica liber. Textum post Lud. Kusterum ad fid.
codd. MSS. recognovit, Ulr. Obrecht interpret. passim mutavit,
Kusteri aliorumque animadd. adjecit suas M. T. Kiessling. Accedit
Porphyrius de vit. Pythag. &c. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Lowth Rob. de Poesi Sacr. Hebr. Praelect. Not. J. D. Michaelis suis animadd. auxit F. C. Rosenmüller. Accedit C. F. Richter, de etate lib. Jobi defin. et Weissi de metro Hariano Com-
ment. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Matthiae, P. Handbuch der Griechischen und Römischen Lite-
ratur 8vo. Jena. 1815.

— Prologus de Pherecydis fragmento. 4to. Altenburg, 1815.
Meinecke, A. Curæ Crit. in comicor. fragm. ab Athenæo servata.
8vo. Berol. 1815.

Ovidii, P. N. quæ supersunt, ad opt. libr. fid. accurate edit.
Tom. i. 18mo. Lips. 1815.

Pappelbaum, G. T. Cod. MS. Græc. Apost. Act. et Epist.
continent. Berolin. asservatum, descripsit, comulit, animad. crit.
adjecit. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Platonis opera, ex recens. Stephani, adject. Scholiis et not. crit.
edidit C. D. Beck. tom. II. 12mo. Lips. 1815.

Plutarchi Vitæ. edidit G. II. Schaefer. tom. VIII—IX. 12mo.
Lips. 1815.

— Edidit A. Coray. 8vo. Paris. 1815.

Poetæ Gr. Gnomici ad opt. lib. fid. acc. edit. 18mo. Lips. 1815.

Ruhnkenii ad Velleium Patrc. Not. Integr. 8vo. Hanover. 1815.

Sappho's Oden, griechisch, und dentsch mit erklärenden anmerk. von E. A. L. Möbius. 8vo. Hannover, 1815.

Siebelis, M. C. G. *Ἑλληνικαὶ seu antiquiss. græcor. historiæ res insigniores usque ad Olympiad. i.* 8vo. Lips. 1815.

^c Spitzner, Fr. de versu Græcorum heroico, maxime Homericō. Accedit M. Fr. Fridemanni Dissertatio de media Syllaba Pentametri Græcorum elegiaci. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Spohn, F. A. G. de agro Trojano in carm. Hom. descripto, Commentatio. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Stößner, C. C. explicatio vulgaris et orthodoxa locor. Ebr. i. 3. et Col. i. 17. ab injuriis recentiorum interpretum vindicat. 4to. Lips. 1815.

~~Augustognidis~~ Eleg. Ex fide MSS. recensuit, et auxit, c. not. Fr. Stößner et R. Fr. Phil. Brunckii, Imman. Bekker. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Thiersch, F. Griechische Grammatik für Schulen. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

Twesteni, A. Comment. crit. de Hesiodi Carm. quod inscribitur Opera et Dies 8vo. Kiliæ. 1815.

Walchii, D. G. L. Encundationes Livianæ. 8vo. Berol. 1815.

Xenophontis Opusc. polit. equestr. et venat. accedit Arrianus libellus de venatione, cura J. G. Schneideri 8vo. Lips. 1815.

— Quæ extant, recens. et interpretatus est J. G. Schneider. Tom. vi. Lips. 1815.

— De Cyri disciplina, libr. viii. edidit J. G. Schneider. 8vo. Lips. 1815.

CLASSICAL.

Prospectus de la Traduction complète des Œuvres de Xénophon par J. B. Gail, Lecteur royal. [L'ouvrage se vend, à Paris, chez Auguste Delalain, Imprimeur-Libraire, rue des Mathurins-Saint-Jacques; et chez Charles Gail neveu, au Collège royal, place Cambrai.]

Les Œuvres complètes de Xénophon (onze volumes in-4^o), comprenant, Texte grec, Versions latine et françoise, Observations historiques et critiques, Collation et specimen de ma-

¹ Avec les beaux caractères de Garamont, qui, trop rarement employés depuis Louis XIV, ont été remis en activité pour cette édition.

muscrits, Cartes géographiques, Tableaux chronologiques, Plans de batailles et de sièges, et une belle collection d'estampes, d'après les dessins de MM. le Barbier, Boichot et Moreau, seront distribuées en sept livraisons, dont la première a paru le 20 Décembre 1814, et les autres successivement de mois en mois. Elles n'éprouveront aucun retard; car tout est imprimé et gravé. Si le tirage des estampes et cartes, qui exige beaucoup de soins, étoit terminé, on pourroit, au moment même, se procurer tout l'ouvrage. Il pourra être demandé, en son entier (l'Atlas excepté), par ceux qui consentiront à réunir les estampes dans l'Atlas, vœu exprimé par plusieurs souscripteurs.

Quoique cet ouvrage, décoré d'estampes, s'annonce avec une sorte de magnificence qui semble devoir en augmenter le prix, on s'apercevra facilement que les propriétaires ont satisfait, par sa modicité réelle, au vœu de l'auteur, qui a voulu rendre accessible à toutes les fortunes le Fénelon de la Grèce.

Prix des sept livraisons, 160 francs, beau papier ordinaire, 320 francs, papier vélin satiné. Il en existe 45 exemplaires, estampes ayant la lettre et eau-forte. Ceux qui n'auront pas souscrit au 1er. juin paieront 200 francs au lieu de 160 francs, et 400 francs au lieu de 320 francs.

L'Avertissement annonce *les Observations militaires et géographiques de M. Gail*; d'après Xénophon et autres auteurs. Quoique très-utiles à la lecture de Xénophon, dont elles expliquent souvent le texte, elles feront néanmoins un ouvrage à part, lequel aura plusieurs volumes. Le 1er. volume, in-8.^o, sera donné gratis aux souscripteurs de Xénophon, lors de la septième livraison. Chacun des volumes suivants leur coûtera 5 francs: 10 francs chaque volume pour les non-souscripteurs de Xénophon.

Nota. Thucydide, et Xénophon son continuateur, allant ensemble, on rappelle que le prix de Thucydide, grec-latin-français, in-4.^o, papier vélin, est de 145 fr.; papier ordinaire, 80 francs. Le même, in-8.^o, 45 francs.

La collection complète (in 4.^o, papier vélin, estampes avant la lettre,) contenant Xénophon, Thucydide, Théocrite, Musée, Anacreon, Mythologie de Lucien, 506 francs.—La même collection, papier ordinaire, fig. après la lettre, 280 francs.

On a tiré deux exemplaires de Xénophon, peau vélin satiné, dont un exemplaire est complet et à vendre.

L'ouvrage (imprimé en grande partie aux frais du Gouvernement) appartient en toute propriété, d'après un acte passé par-devant notaire, à un particulier qui a fait imprimer à ses frais une partie de l'ouvrage, et graver à ses frais l'Atlas tout entier et la collection des estampes. J'ai dû faire cette remarque, étant forcé de déroger, pour Xénophon, à l'usage où j'étois de faire, à des gens de lettres, hommage de cinquante à soixante exemplaires de chacun de mes ouvrages.

M. Tullii Ciceronis trium Orationum in Clodium et Curionem, de ære alieno Milonis, de Rege Alexandrino, Fragmenta inedita; Item ad tres prædictas Orationes, et ad alias Tullianas quatuor editas commentarius antiquius ineditus, qui videtur Asconij Pediani; Scholia insuper antiqua et inedita, quæ videntur excerpta e Commentario deperdito ejusdem Asconii Pediani ad alias rursus quatuor Ciceronis editas Orationes—Omnium ex antiquissimis MSS. cum Criticis notis edebat *Angelus Maius* Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ a linguis orientalibus Mediolani.

In the month of November, 1814, the literary world was informed of a discovery of a manuscript in the Ambrosian library at Milan, containing some fragments of three Orations of Cicero, which were supposed to have been lost; the publication of these was almost immediately followed by that of several fragments of three other Orations of Cicero, which had also been discovered in the library; together with an ample commentary, supposed to be by Asconius Pedianus on the above, and on eight others of Cicero's Orations, which had been already published.

The first of the inedited Orations of Cicero is "In P. Clodium et Curionem," that is relative to a violation of public decorum committed by P. Clodius during the ceremonies of sacrifice to the Goddess *Bona*.

The second is entitled, "De ære alieno Milonis," that is, respecting the debts of Milo, and was pronounced on the occasion of that person becoming candidate for the Consulate.—The discovery of the fragments of this Oration is of great importance, as it does not appear that the learned had preserved any record of its ever having existed.

The third inedited Oration is entitled "De Rege Alexandrino," and was delivered in a discussion which took place in the Roman Senate respecting the re-establishment of Ptolomeus Auletes on the throne of Egypt.

The Fragments of Cicero are illustrated by an inedited and ample commentary, which has also been discovered, and is now published for the first time. It relates to the Orations already published of Cicero, pro Aelia, pro Sylla, pro Plancio, in Vatinium: and also (but with much more brevity) to the Orations Quarta Catilinaria, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro.

This commentary is highly valuable on several accounts—1st, as it is extremely probable, nay, almost certain, that it is the production of Asconius Pedianus—2ndly, because it is of the purest Latinity, is replete with historical allusions and illustrations, and contains some Latin words, of which we had no knowledge—3dly, It refers to two productions of Cicero, of which we were altogether ignorant, viz. Edictum L. Racillii Tr. Pl. in invectio-

gem P. Clodii, and "Epistola ad instar voluminis de consulatu suo ad Pompeium." It also contains an inedited passage of the comic author Afranius, and an interesting Fragment of an Oration of the tribune of the people Caius Gracchus.

The discoverer and editor of these Fragments has prefixed to them a dissertation, wherein he relates the manner in which the discovery was made, and points out its classical importance. He then enumerates all the arguments on which he founds his opinion, that the commentary is that part of Asconius Pedianus, of which the injuries and accidents of time had deprived us. He examines with critical acuteness, and endeavours to ascertain the precise period at which Asconius wrote, a subject on which ancient and modern writers have been divided in opinion. The result of his researches is, that Asconius, the commentator of Cicero, was acquainted with Virgil and Livy, that he continued his literary pursuits at a very advanced age under the Emperor Claudio.—Finally, he discusses the age of the manuscripts from which he has taken these Fragments, and proves their great antiquity.

The editor has illustrated the Fragments of Tully, and the commentary with Notes, explanatory of the ancient Text; and has added accurate engravings of the characters in which the manuscript was written, from whence the work is taken.

A copy of the above having been obtained from Milan, it will soon be republished in this country.

ORIENTAL.

Extract of a Memoir, By DR. CAREY, DR. MARSHMAN, and MR. WARD.

The languages, in which we are now translating and printing the Scriptures in the Middle of India, are, the Sungskrit, the Bengalee, the Orissa, the Mahratta, and the Hindee, with its dialects, the Brij-bhasa, and those current in Oodya-pore and Joy-pore.

1. The *Sungskrit*.—The Sungskrit, as the parent of the other Indian Dialects, demands the first place. It has been already said, that in this language the New Testament and the Pentateuch have been long printed. The Historical Books are nearly printed off, the Second Book of the Chronicles being now in the press.

2. *Bengalee*.—In the Bengalee Language, the fourth edition of the New Testament, containing five thousand copies, is more than half through the press. This is the largest edition we have yet printed, and we have reason to think, the most accurate, as the corrections made in it, which are by no means few, are the fruit of twenty years' acquaintance with the language.

3. The *Orissa*.—In this dialect, four volumes of the Scriptures have been long published; and this year will probably complete the printing of the whole Scriptures. The Pentateuch is printed to the middle

of Leviticus. The publication of the other parts of the Old Testament has been already particularized.

4. The *Mahratta*.—In this language, among the most extensive of the dialects of India, the New Testament and the Pentateuch are in circulation. Of the Historical Books in the press, five books are printed off, the First Book of Kings being begun. The translation of the whole Scriptures in this language, the Psalms excepted, has been long finished.

5. The *Hindee*.—This language, which, with its varieties, embraces so great a part of India, has long had both the New Testament and the Pentateuch in circulation; and the increasing desire manifested for the Scriptures, has exhausted the first edition of the former, and called for more than half the latter, which consisted of a thousand copies each. A second edition of the New Testament may be said to be finished, as only a few chapters of the Revelations remain to be printed off. This edition consists of four thousand copies.

6. The *Brij-bhasa*.—In this dialect, esteemed by Gilchrist the purest dialect of the Hindee, and which is spoken in the upper parts of Sindoostan, from Agra to Sirdhana, the Gospels are printed as far as St. Luke, which is in the press. Mr. Chamberlain, now at Sirdhana, is vigorously advancing with the rest of the Scriptures, for which his acquaintance with Hindee in general, as well as that dialect in particular, eminently qualifies him. The following versions may be considered as varieties of the Hindee.

7. The *Joypore*.—This variety of the Hindee is spoken in the little territory of this name, which lies west of Agra toward Guzurat, and is governed by its own Prince. The points in which this dialect differs from the Hindee are not very numerous, the great body of the language being the same. The alteration, however, of a few terminations, and a few leading words of frequent recurrence, to acquire which would cost a man, accustomed to philological studies, scarcely a month, causes such a difference to the unlearned and the poor, for whom the word of God is intended, as to render the version which has it perspicuous, while one without it will be scarcely intelligible, and be therefore laid aside. As this version is printed in the Naguree Character, it is already in the press, and a few chapters of St. Matthew printed off.

8. *Oodyapore*.¹—South-west of Agra, and toward Bombay, lies the district of *Oodyapore*, governed by its own prince, which differs in certain instances both from the Hindee, and from the other dialects spoken around. The character, however, is the same. The Gospel of St. Matthew in this version is also in the press. There are several other dialects of the Hindee, for which preparations of the same kind are making, as that of Bekaneer, west of Joypore, and of Marwar, still farther west, which will almost complete the Scriptures in the various dialects of Hindee. Having thus mentioned the dialects in the

¹ Pinkerton, "Oodypour."

middle part of India in which we are engaged, we turn to those in the south.

9. The *Telinga*.—The languages on the southern side of India in which we are engaged are two, the Telinga and the Kurnata. In the Telinga, a very large fount of types is now prepared, and the printing of the New Testament advanced as far as St. Luke's Gospel. The whole of the New Testament is translated; and a considerable progress made in the Pentateuch.

10. The *Kurnata*.—In this language, which begins to the south where the Mahratta ends, and is current through the whole of the Mysore Country, the alteration requisite in the types has caused some delay; but we have at length been enabled to complete a suitable fount of types, and to put the Gospel by St. Matthew to press. The translation of the New Testament is finished, and the Pentateuch begun.

11. The *Kankona*.—The Kankona is the first to the west of India in which we are engaged. This language begins where the Mahratta ends to the west, and is spoken from Bombay to Goa. In this language the New Testament is nearly translated, and the Gospel by St. Matthew is in the press. The type is the Deva-Nagurice.

12. The *Wutch*.—Still more to the north-west, on this side the Indus, the Wutch dialect is spoken, which also has a character of its own. Learned natives of this province too have been found in Calcutta; a translation has commenced, and a fount of types has been cut. In this dialect, the Gospel of St. Matthew is in the press. The language of the province of Sindh, the capital of which stands in the Delta, formed by the river Indus, differs somewhat from this; but the character is nearly the same. In this too a version of the New Testament is begun.

13. The *Bullochee*.—On the west bank of the Indus is the Bullochee country, of which an account was given in our last report. In this language, the progress in printing has been slow; but the Gospel by St. Matthew is printed off, and St. Mark is in the press.

14. The *Pushtoo*.—The Pushtoo Language follows, or that of the Afghans, possibly descended from the Ten Tribes. In this language the New Testament is translated, and the three first books of the Pentateuch. The Gospel of St. Matthew is printed off, and St. Mark begun. We proceed to the north-west.

15. The *Punjabee*.—Northward, within the Indus, we come to the Punjabee language, or that of the Shikhs. In this language it is with pleasure we add, that the New Testament is printed off within a chapter or two; which version makes the sixth, in which we have been enabled to complete the New Testament. The Pentateuch is nearly translated.

16. The *Kashmeer*.—To the north of the *Shikha*, lies the province of Kashmeer, in the language of which the translation of the New Testament is now finished; but the progress made in printing has been small: the Gospel by St. Matthew is, however, nearly printed

off. It has been already said, that this language has a beautiful character of its own.

17. The *Nepaul*.—Proceeding eastward from the *Punjab*, we come to the kingdom of *Nepaul*, on the north-east of Hindooostan. In the language of this kingdom a translation has been begun nearly two years. The four Gospels are nearly finished, and that of St. Matthew in the press. It has a very close affinity with the Hindoo; and the character is the Deva-Naguree.

18. The *Assam*.—To the north-east of *Nepaul* we have the kingdom of *Assam*, in the language of which a translation has been going forward for some years. The whole of the New Testament is translated, and the Pentateuch nearly finished. The Gospels of St. Matthew and Mark are printed off, and that of St. Luke is in the press.

19. The *Kassai*.—Still more eastward, and within a hundred leagues of China, is the *Kassai* Nation, a race of whose honesty and fair dealing English gentlemen who have resided near them give a pleasant account of *Brij*. These mountaineers, who have a constant intercourse with the people of *Sylhet*, have no character of their own; nor, strictly speaking, a written language. The few among them who can write, use the Bengalee character. The language has a much greater affinity with the Chinese, however, than with the Bengalee, which may be inferred even from their personal pronouns.¹ In the language of these mountaineers a translation has been begun, which is advanced to the Gospel of St. John; and St. Matthew is in the press, in the Bengalee character.

20. The *Burman*.—To the south-east of the *Kassai* mountains we come to the Burman empire; from which country, since we have sent a press thither, we have not particularly heard respecting the progress of the translation. The press has, we believe, been ordered up to *Ava*, the seat of government, together with Mr. F. Carey.

21. The *Chinese*.—This language terminates our work of translation eastward, respecting which the various leadings of Divine Providence in furnishing and continuing to us the means, till the translation of the New Testament is finished, together with that of the Old as far as the middle of the Book of Psalms, and founts of types prepared to print them both, seems proportioned to the importance of the object. We have put the Pentateuch to press in a new fount of Chinese types, in which we shall be able to carry it forward, while we are completing that of the New Testament in the former types, as three or four of the epistles are already through the press. In printing Chinese with moveable types, an edition proceeds slowly at the beginning, as the number required for the first few forms is very great, particularly in such a work as the Old Testament. The first twenty chapters of Genesis contain most of the names which occur in the Pentateuch: hence

BENGALEE,	I, <i>Anme</i> ,	Thou, <i>Toomee</i> ,	He. <i>Tinnee</i> .
CHINESE,	Ngo,	Nee,	Tha.
KASSAI,	Nga,	Fee,	Tu.

these chapters have occupied the better part of the year in preparing the requisite types. This delay in the beginning is, however, amply compensated by the ease and speed with which the latter part of the version, and indeed successive and improved editions, can be completed with the same types. In proceeding with these types, we have ascertained, that the use of a press, and the cheapness of labor in Bengal, which has enabled us to furnish the Hindoo New Testament of more than six hundred pages octavo for a rupee, will enable us to print editions of the Chinese Scripture, containing any number of copies, at less than half the expense of printing in China. This will not be a matter of wonder to those who consider that provisions, which regulate the price of manual labor, can be obtained in Bengal for little more than a third of the price they bear in China.

On reviewing these languages, we shall perceive that of those which have been more recently entered upon, the *Oodyapore*, the *Joypore*, and indeed the *Nepaul*, are varieties of the Hindoo; that the *Kankana* is a variety of the Mahratta; and that the *Kassai* has a strong affinity with the Chinese. Nearly all the languages in which we are engaged may therefore be traced to two great sources, the Sanskrit and the Chinese, to which they approximate in various degrees. To the cultivation of these two, our attention is directed.

Histoire Abrégée de la Littérature Romaine, par F. Schoell, conseiller de cour de S. M. le Roi de Prusse, &c. 4 vol. 8vo. Paris, 1815.

Essai sur les Mystères d'Eleusis. 2d. ed. St. Petersbourg, 1815. (par M. Ouvaroff.)

IN THE PRESS.

Mr. DYER, the author of the ‘History of the University and Colleges of Cambridge,’ has in the Press, a work entitled “The Privileges of the University of Cambridge,” containing a chronological table of all its charters, with their titles, from the earliest to more modern times, arranged in exact order, according to the Christian era, and the kings of England; together with a series of the principal charters themselves, and the statutes of Queen Elizabeth. It will be also accompanied with other public instruments and documents; being intended to serve as Fasti to the History of Cambridge. To the end will be subjoined various additions and emendations to Mr. Dyer’s own History of the University and Colleges. The greater part of the work will be in Latin: to the Latin part will be prefixed a Latin Dissertation, addressed ‘Viro Academicis;’ to the English, will be subjoined an English Dissertation on the contents of the whole volume. The work, we understand, is nearly all printed, but not to be published till the winter. It will be published by Subscription.

M. Thiebant de BERNEAUD intends to publish an edition of all the works of Theophrastus, including all the fragments of his

NO. XXIII.

Ct. Jl.

VOL. XII.

Q

author, dispersed in the whole circuit of classic literature. It will be preceded by an introduction, containing the Life of Theophrastus, and a critical estimate of his works, besides an account of all the extant MSS. of his works, and an enumeration of all the editions and translations of Theophrastus, since the fifteenth century.

We understand that a son of a very celebrated engraver is attempting to unfold, under the directions of the Rev. JOHN HADDER, F. A. S. one of the six Herculaneum MSS. presented by his Sicilian Majesty to the Prince Regent. We believe this ~~MSS.~~ to have been previously attempted by Dr. YOUNG.

A Selection of *Æsop's Fables*, with English Notes and Questions, for Schools.

Ovidii Metamorphoses Selectæ, et in usum Scholarum expurgatæ, in Notis Anglicis. By the Rev. C. Bradley.

~~ect.~~ New Edition of Mr. Jones's *Latin Grammar*.

JUST PUBLISHED.

A Neat Edition of the *Greek Testament*. The text is taken from the edition now publishing by the Rev. E. Valpy. It is printed in duodecimo, for the use of Schools.

M. Tullii Ciceronis de Officiis, Libri Tres; juxta editionem J. M. et J. Frid. Heusingerorum. Accedunt, in gratiam juventutis, notæ quædam Anglice scriptæ. Pr. 6s. boards.

Diatessaron, seu Integra Historia Domini nostri J. C. Latine ex quatuor Evangelii inter se collatis; ipsisque Evangelistarum verbis apte et ordinata dispositis confecta. E Versione præcipue Castellionis castigata et emendata. Cui præfiguntur Tabula Palearctica Geographica, necnon Ordo Rerum. Opera et studio T. Thirlwall, A. M. Edit. sec. Pr. 4s. 6d.

An Introduction to the Greek Language; containing the most useful rules of Syntax, and a new set of Exercises, on an improved plan. By the Rev. Mr. Picquot. Pr. 3s.

Elements of Latin Prosody, with Exercises and Questions, designed as an Introduction to the scanning and making Latin Verses. By the Rev. C. Bradley. 4s. bound. A Key may be had by private application. Pr. 2s. 6d.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Dissertation on the *Origin of the Abyssinians* has not yet been received by us. We hope the author will make further inquiries on the subject.

Remarks on 1 Tim. iii. 16. will shortly appear.

Loci quidam Luciani emendati, &c. will be continued in next.

A Notice of Rich's *Memoir on the Ruins of Babylon* in our next.

Professor Brown's *Latin Prize Essays* will appear future Nos.

M.'s valuable articles will shortly appear.

Abbé Morso's *Chart of Arabic Grammar* will certainly appear in No. XXIV. We are sorry to disappoint TYRO, but if he would call on the Printer, a satisfactory reason for the delay would be offered to him.

A French writer of the 17th century seriously advises authors not to send well-written copies to the printer; for he says that in that case the work will be given to a young apprentice, and be full of errors; but if the copy be badly written, it will be put in the hands of a correct compositor. We presume that T. P. has had this advice in view.

A *Friend to Consistency* informs us that "a critic who sarcastically reproved us for once printing Mytilene for Mitylene, has since adopted the former spelling." We had observed the reproof, but not the recantation; we hope that the latter was as candid, as the former was severe.

The critical notice of Smith's *Greek Translation of Jewell's Apologia Ecclesiae Anglicanæ*, lately republished by Mr. Campbell of Pontefract, was too late for our present number. It shall be inserted in our next.

We are much obliged for the loan of Burton's tract *Pers. Ling. Hist. &c.*, of which we shall make use in a future No.

We are sorry that an accident has deprived our readers of No. III. *On Greek and Latin Accents* in this Number. It shall certainly appear in the next.

The same observation applies to the Notes on Plato.

1. Ave.
2. Do—mus.
3. S—omnia.
4. Maro. Roma.
5. N—omen.
6. Mus—ca—tum.
7. Silex—ilex—lex—cx—x—sile.

END OF NO. XXIII.

[ADVERTISEMENT.]

**CHEAPEST HEBREW BIBLE,
GERMAN EDITION.**

T. BOOSEY, 4, BROAD-STREET, EXCHANGE,

Respectfully informs Biblical Students, School-masters, Oriental Scholars, and the Literary World in general, that he has just imported a number of HEBREW BIBLES, edited by REINECCIUS, DOERDERLEIN, and MEISNER, with very extensive Readings, Collations, and Masoretic Notes, &c. by KENNICOTT and DE ROSSI, forming Two Volumes, 8vo. with Points, Accents, &c. on very good Paper, and at the moderate Price of 16s ; a price so reasonable, it is to be hoped, will meet the attention of Oriental Scholars, &c. who have been prevented from purchasing by the exorbitant prices they are charged in England.

THE
CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

N^o. XXIV.

DECEMBER, 1815.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

YOUR correspondent M. in *Vol. x. p. 268.* has noticed, what he thinks, an error, in my article, *Vol. viii. p. 377.* viz. "In the ninth century—Jerome began to mend the first Latin translation by the Hebrew," and he asks, "are we to believe him right when he tells us that Jerome did not live until the ninth century?" Were I disposed to cavil, I might ask what *ninth century* does this gentleman mean? it was certainly in *a ninth century* that Jerome began to correct the first Latin translation. If your correspondent will read, after the words, '*in the ninth century*',—the words, '*after the captivity*', which were accidentally omitted in the second MS. for the press, he will find I was right; viz. *In the ninth century after the captivity Jerome began, &c.* Jerome was born A. D. 329, and the Hebrews returned from the captivity 596 years before Christ, which was in the ninth century *after the captivity*.

Your learned correspondent R. M. C. also makes a remark *Vol. x. p. 335.* concerning the word *ELOHIM* in my *History of all Religions, second edition*; he is also pleased to give this work a very high character; he says—"a work which undoubtedly does the author the highest credit, equally as the Gentleman, the Biblical Scholar, the Orthodox Theologian, and the Genuine Christian." I have not the pleasure of being personally known to this writer. With regard to my orthodoxy, I was brought up in the established church. I believe her doctrines to be perfectly consistent with the sacred scriptures; and if I have any claim to the character of "genuine Christian," I believe with the church that it is not on the ground of my own merit.

If this gentleman be not already satisfied with what has been said in proof that אלהָם is a *noun singular*, comprehending the *Divine Trinity in Unity*, perfectly conformable to that admirable definition of the belief of the apostolic churches, which we call the ATHANASIAN CREED: I hope he will be, when he reads the note on Gen. i. 1. which will appear in my new translation of the book of Genesis, as soon as a sufficient number of subscribers (who are already of the most respectable and learned class) enable me to go to press.

He expresses surprise, “that מֶלֶךְ should be still conceived of the *singular number*, by Mr. Bellamy, contrary to the now generally received opinion of every biblical student.” To assume the point in dispute is an easy way of settling it, and therefore he adds, “as this can therefore be *no longer considered as a controverted point*, to attempt to go over the ground again, with the abundant proofs that may be deduced from the sacred volume, and which is already done by the many able writers of the present day, particularly by the author of the *Commentaries and critical Notes on the Holy Scriptures*, could manifestly add no farther weight to the now decided argument respecting the plurality of the word ELOHIM.” The proofs adduced by “the author,” to whom he alludes, Dr. A. Clarke, have been laid before your readers, and have been objected to in your pages; nor have the objections been yet answered. They may also be further seen at large in the OPINION, a work I lately published.

R. M. C. having begged the question, would have done well, if he had abstained from all farther remark; but he enters the field of controversy with an argument highly injurious to the cause which he attempts to advocate. “No classical reader,” he observes, “needs to be reminded, that nothing is more frequently to be met with, than grammatical anomalies respecting the agreement and the government of words. The Arabic, the Hebrew, with all their dependent tongues, abound with them. Hence we find singular nouns connected with plural verbs, and plural nouns with singular verbs.” If so, what becomes of the argument drawn by Hutchinson, Parkhurst, Hailes, and Dr. A. Clarke, from a few passages, which they have supposed so connected, when, in every other instance throughout the scriptures, that word is found joined with nouns, adjectives, and verbs, singular? As to his quotations from common Hebrew Grammars, they may prove satisfactory to some, but they are not consistent with the genius, phraseology and grammar of the sacred language. By the word *anomaly*, as applied by your learned correspondent, I cannot allow that it will authorise him to consider, that a noun plural may be connected with a verb singular, or vice versa; in such case, the word “grammatical” would be very improper; for throughout the

scripture, and in all languages, such kind of “anomaly,” as this writer means, cannot be understood. By *anomaly*, I understand a *deviation from rule*; but there is no rule to be found in Scripture, that will authorise us to deviate from *good sense*; which would necessarily be the case, if such kind of anomaly were admitted.

J. BELLAMY.

North Place, Gray's Inn Lane.

NOTICE OF

UTRIUSQUE LEONIDE CARMINA. *Cum Argumentis,
varietate lectionis, scholiis, et commentario, edidit et in-
dice ornavit ALBERT. CHRIST. MEINEKE, apud Susa-
tenses Rector.* Lips. in libr. Weidmannia. small 8vo.

THIS is a very useful edition of two very middling writers, Leonidas Tarentinus, and Leonidas Alexandrinus. Meineke, a scholar of some reputation in Germany, undertook the edition for a double reason: to collect into one volume the principal researches which different critics had made on his authors; and to assist such young men as might be inclined to form an acquaintance with them. The text is that of Brunck, with a few differences, some readings, which he afterwards proposed, having in this edition been received into the text. Some of the notes exhibit various readings, collected from different editions: others are explanatory, in which parallel passages from other writers are adduced, and the senses of unusual words investigated. For this reason it may be of some use to the editors of the new edition of Stephens' Thesaurus.— Upon the whole, to such as turn their thoughts towards the illustration of the writers of the Anthology, the book will be of considerable use: as it is frequently necessary, in order to understand the best writers of Epigrams, to read with attention the worst. We do not indeed rank either of our authors in the latter class: to those who wish to read pretty conceits on love and wine; or to learn all the various *formulae* by which superannuated heroes, or decayed rakes, in days of yore dedicated themselves to the innumerable inhabitants of the celestial Billingsgate, Olympus, this volume may be a very agreeable companion. In reading it, they will be much better employed than in perusing similar *jeux d'esprit* of the present day.

NOTICE OF

'*A GENERAL INTRODUCTION to the Study of the HEBREW SCRIPTURES, with a Critical History of the Greek and Latin Versions, of the Samaritan Pentateuch, and of the Chaldee Paraphrases.* By the Rev. G. HAMILTON, Rector of Killermogh.' Dublin, 8vo. pp. 197. 1813.

WHY will not these *Historiae Criticæ Scriptores* first read the latest and best writers on the subject of which they treat? and if the proper books are either inaccessible to them, or unintelligible, because written in languages which they do not understand, why will they write at all? These questions have been suggested to us by the perusal of Mr. Hamilton's work. We have not, indeed, much reason to complain of faults of commission: for what he has done, he has done well: but we must be permitted to say, that he has omitted a great deal, of which he ought to have been particular in treating. The author has, it is true, acted up to what he promised in his Title Page; but there he did not take in a sufficiently wide range. Of the Peshito, or Syriac Version, he has not said a word: yet this version is decidedly one of the most valuable, and he has promised (Preface, p. vi.) to "give in a form, calculated for general circulation, satisfactory information on some subjects connected with the study of the Hebrew Bible, and of the *best known of its ancient versions.*" This defect is more inexcusable because much information respecting it is contained in books written in Latin, namely in Walton's *Prolégomena in Biblia Polyglotta*, in Asseman's *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, and in Dathe's Preface to his edition of the Syriac Psalter (8vo. Halæ Sax. 1768). In the same manner he has omitted the Arabic Version, though it has been treated of in Latin works innumerable: neither has he even so much as hinted the existence of an Æthiopic or Egyptian version, though Ludolf has treated of the first in his *Historia Æthiopica*, Francf. 1699. and Woide has excellently described the latter in his *Dissertatio de Bibliorum versione Ægyptiaca*, Oxon. 1799.

Another great defect is, his apparent ignorance of the German language, which to a Biblical Critic is almost essential, on account of the numerous discoveries which have lately been made in Germany, and which are recorded in the *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek* of Michaelis, in Eichhorn's *Repertorium für Biblischen und Morgenländischen Literatur*, and his *Allge-*

meine Bibliothek der Biblischen Literatur, and other periodical works of the same description; not to mention the innumerable valuable commentaries and other works of the German critics; from not having read these, Mr. H. is nearly a century behind hand, in his information.

From Eichhorn's *Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments*, most important information might have been given; but Mr. H. does not appear to know that such a book even exists. His work, therefore, is decidedly inferior, even to a small octavo volume published many years ago by Dr. Bauer, as a guide to his *Academical Lectures*.¹ Mr. Hamilton, however, if he will attend to German Literature, may raise a very useful superstructure upon the foundation he has laid in his present work: we have already said, that what he has done, he appears to have done well, and we have complained, not of his prolixity, but of his conciseness. But imperfect and unsatisfactory as his book is, we hail it with considerable pleasure, as affording some beginning of critical literature in a country, which has been hitherto, of all others, Spain and Portugal excepted, the most unprolific.

ORATIO

Habita Cantabrigiæ in Sacello Collegioque S. S. et Individua Trinitatis Solenni festoque die Fundatoris memoriæ sacro, octavo kalendas Junii MDCCCLV. Ex Testamento optimi nuper viri JOH. WILSONI, S. T. P. Perorante GUL. MASKELYNE, A. M. Ejusdem Collegii Socio.

LETITIAQUE concursusque vester, Academici, atque hujusce diei solennitas, ipsius insuper loci religio, cuius celebrandi gratia huc convenimus, maxima inter mortales beneficia recensenti mihi sumum in hac re studium vestrum et benevolentiam cum silentio pollicentur. Quanquam autem perspectum habeam pro virtute ac nominis eorum gloria, qui a principio has Musarum zedes condiderunt, vel deinceps aliquo ornamento adauxerunt, dignam satis orationem vix inveniri quidem posse, qualibus tamen cunque viribus aggrediendum est: ne parum honestum sit nobis eos, quorum

¹ Entwurf einer Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testaments. (*Sketch of an Introduction to the Scriptures of the Old Testament,*) 8vo. Nürnberg und Altdorf. 1794.

opera docti atque edocti sumus probe, quia perfecta erant ipsi pietate, ideo ne minores quidem consecutos esse laudes.

Quis autem melius optimorum virorum laudes concinet, quam qui facta enarraverit? cuius item hominis majus unquam in nos beneficium extitit, aut prius antiquiusve, quam Hervici Stanton, Suffolciensis? qui jam inde ab Edvardi secundi regis temporibus privatis opibus vere magnificentum ausus opus sanctam Michaelis, id nomen erat, domum ex adverso in latere australi Musis feliciter posuit. Sic deinde ex mente ipsius positam, nequid tanto numeri deesset, iis annuis redditibus firmavit ac locupletavit, quibus vel adhuc gloriari nobis jure maximo licet. Is tum ibi vir bonus pulcherrimo facto suo gaudebat intuens, nescius sane quanta mox incrementa secum esset allatura dies; cui tum urbi, ut ita dicam, lapidem angularem ipse manu sua fundasset, ac primas tantum lineas designasset.

Nec longo deinde annorum intervallo consimili flagrans literarum bonarum atque artium amore Edvardus tertius rex aulam hic regiam, ab ipsius fundatore sic vocitatem, turre illa sua observabilem, faustis magis dicam auspiciis, an secundo rerum exitu, an pio magis consilio construebat? Jam tum inimica gens Gallia regis illius, illius inquam nostri sapientiam, atque animi magnitudinem persipientes superbiam suam melius deposuerint: cum jamdum non dubiis signis, nisi eorum mentes obccasset Deus, præ sagire poterant qui motus animorum, quæ ipsorum fuga, quæ strages, siquando in Pictavinum campum descenderet, essent futuræ. Quinimo plane furere, quando in lubitum fuerit, iis hostibus suo semper cum periculo sinimus: nos vero ad propositum institutum revertamur.

Hic tamen, quantumvis arctati simus temporis angustiis, pium, probum virum, atque huic loco et his studiis benevolentissimum Henricum sextum regem præterire esset nefas. Qui cum istis fundamentis, quæ rex ille dudum hostium vitor, proavus autem suus Edvardus jecerat, impensius faveret, aquam aliam fistulis subter alveum fluminis salubriorem ex longinquò deducebat. Quæ res, quanto sit ornamento, videtis: quam ad multa sit perutilis, cito ex aliorum inopia, quam ex vestra maxima illa copia colligetis.

Proximus deinde Edvardus quartus rerum omnium, parta victoria, potens nihil horum permutari, nihil sua sede moveri, per eas denique literas, quæ patentes vocantur, nihil non ratum confirmatumque esse voluit. Ita dissidentes inter se Eboracensis domus et Lancastriæ principes hic saltem onnes honeste certaverunt, uter utri benefaciendo sit prior.

Huc addamus, minorum quamvis gentium munera, non aspernenda vicina illa quidem hospitia Margaretana, Fesviana, One thana, Jaretana. Quæ cum nullis essent opibus, nullis legibus, nondum certo aliquo doctrinæ investigandæ duce, morum itidem

nullo censore uterentur, hoc tantum præ se ferebant, huic unico commodo inserviebant, studiosis omnibus tectum, larem, perfugium interim dando, commune quoddam sese quasi asylum literarum aperuisse.

Jamque pro ea, qua semper fuit, animi majestate Henricus octavus rex, fundator, pater nostrum omnium, rem magnam ausus novo prorsus consilio has senas ædes omnes conjungendi, dein sub uno eodemque magistro in perpetuum ævum stabiliendi, ne sit alicubi in terris florentior Musarum sedes; (absit tantis dictis invidia, dum vera tota mente proferam, quodque alienis meritis testimonium redderem, in eo cives non defraudem meos), hoc, inquam præclaro consilio usus, ut ex immenso illo Chao ordinem quendam, usum, lucem, gratiam ac dignitatem explicaret, intermedia omnia ædificia disjecit; quæ minus decora officiebant oculis, aut huic formæ, quam pulcherrimam intuemini, inservire ullo modo negabant, sustulit; reliqua hæc mira arte ac diligentia consarciebat; monachorum, pessinæ gregis hominum, quos ille suis sedibus exules egerat, præda atque opimis spoliis ditabat; magistrum deinde præposuit. Sic demum universa illa materia in unum quodammodo corpus redacta, ita ut nihil truncum atque informe, aut etiam quovis loco deficere videretur, nihil rursus abundaret, una identidem anima, unus sensus, eadem cogitatio prorsus inesse omnibus videbatur. Quod quidem opus omnibus suis numeris absolutum, perfectumque videns ille ipse qui condiderat artifex, nequid religionis aut omnis boni deesse videretur, bona, felicia, faustaque omnia precatus hanc ædem suam Deo propriam fieri, ejus numine semper atque imperio regi, sacrosanctæ et individuæ Trinitati sacram esse voluit, inde ei nomen dedit. Cujus autem beneficii gratiam et commune commodum ad vos omnes, Academici, pertinere sæpius intellexistis, Henricus noster, quod bono esset publico, tres illos lectores constituit, qui de Deo rebusque divinis, qui Græce, qui Hebraice optimorum ac juratorum insuper septemvirorum judicio plurimum callerent. Qua tamen ratione dignitatis exinde aliquid huic collegio suo accederet, hic locum, tectum dedit; mensam iis viris apposuit; societatem, siquando velint, addidit; ex hoc potissimum tot florentium virorum numero deligi voluit.

Quid? ipsius postea conditoris filius Edvardus sextus rex quo erga nos animo in diem futurus videbatur, cum vel in ipso brevisimæ vitæ cursu patris ea benefacta rata nobis fecerit, et certissima manu sua confirmaverit? Quid? altera deinde soboles Maria regina, cum inter alia munera hujuscce sacelli fundamenta poneret, cujus tandem pietatis esse videbatur? quod fenestras jam tenus eductum, ne sola eadem ad summum fastigium perduceret, mors fuit impedimento.

Quid? illa etiam altera, Henrice, stirpis tuæ gloria, filia Elisa regina qualis erat nutrix sautrixque horum omnium, condita autem

schola Westmonasteriens, mater mea alma, pia, felix, numquid hoc sermone meo attigisse satis sit? num, festinante me quidem ad tuas iterum laudes repetendas, hoc tantillulum sibi habeat præconium? numquid hanc nomine tantum salutatam sic dimittamus? idque audire modo tibi, pater, tuoque huic populo in præsens sufficiat? an omni potius contentione virium hoc loco sapientem principem celebramus? Quæ cum patriis virtutibus olim res publicas administraret, ac forti supra foeminas animo teterim illam tempestatem Hispanicam his oris avertisset, colonias Americanas commercii causa, et in his unicam præcipuum eam, quam nunc Galli suis injuriis creptum eunt, Virginiam condidisset, hostes ubique terra marique perdomuisse, pacis perinde artibus idonea nequaquam minorem laborantis tum religionis ac doctrinæ rationem secum interim instituerat. Cujus tam doctæ olim patronæ desiderio pios multos literatosque viros etiamnum teneri censeo. Quæ singulari quodam consilio ab utriusque Academiæ Cancellariis excipitabatur, increpationibus interdum minisque flagitabat, "quianam in his ædibus cum singulis tum universis, quanam in re, quantumque eminerent: id certiore cam facerent, planeque edocerent:" hac mente scilicet, ne cujuspam latere ingenium posset regiis negotiis suo mox tempore præficiendum. Quod ad nos attinet maxime pro ea, qua singulari fuit, prudentia annuos hujuscemodum collegii reditus, cum vilior indies fieret pecunia, præfinitis frumentorum modiis solvi statuto publico jussit. Ad hæc collegium divi Petri apud Westmonasterienses scholamque celeberrimam illam quidem, et totius Britanniae longe maximam, quam rem præteriens acu modo quasi tetigeram, in usum literarum elegantiorum Elisa regina condidit: unde discipuli quotannis in utramque pariter Academiani eligantur, et in hanc ædem nostram, quasi fonte quodam perenni, feliciter deducantur. Prima quoque legibus ac statutis hanc domum fundavit, quibus deinceps oraculo tanquam Pythio comprobatis obtemperandum est. Hanccine vero tantam, ita me Dei filius amet, tam divitem hodie patriam, haberemus, tam omnibus copiis navalibus instructam, literis excultam, vera atque unica religione gaudentem, nisi ea omnia in ipsis pæne primordiis interiora haec Dex proprior quam foeminas regina conservasset, atque insuper a tantæ calamitatis metu in posterum vindicasset.

Vos quoque piæ animæ, qui aliquam domus hujuscemodi nostræ partem opibus vestris illustrastis, universos simul jubeo salvere, valere: cum omnes sane longo ordine commemorare esset infinitum. Vestra, vestra inquam pietate, quod hos omnes licet attestari, et ea tot beneficiorum copia, velut rore matutino, non singulam tantum artem scientiamve irrigastis, sed totum quantus est disciplinarum campum recreastis atque refecistis.

Atque eccam bibliothecam, quanta sit, nostram! qualis autem quotidiano usu plerique pernoverint: quod insigne pietatis et mu-

nificantē monumentum ex privatorum donis confiatum est. Hic coemtos undique nobiles libros consulere est: hic poetarum cho-rum optimum, hic mathematicorum universam supellectilem, hic Socraticam domum, hic omnigenae scientiæ monumenta, quæ vel antiquissima manu scripta inveniantur, vel arte feliciore quotidie imprimuntur. Hinc siqua olim veteribus scriptis exciderunt minus indies desiderantur: quorum tantis nos ipsi naufragii ditamur; quanta stante adhuc et florente Græcia, atque incolume urbe Roma, ne per longa quidem sæcula in terrarum orbis ultimam tum hanc insulam fors ulla devexisset: nunc autem toto æquore jactatos nec opinantibus nobis Deus, ille adeo, qui tempestatem eam certe excita-averat, his oris atque his maxime hospitiis appulit Deus. Hinc solida veritate pascitur mens humana, adornatur, locupletatur: ut incredibile nobis prorsus videatur tantum malorum omnium diluvium aliquando extitisse, quantum represserit, atque revera hic quoque doctrina quotidie reprimat. Quare nequis in os mihi doc-trinam inter privatos cujusque parietes inveniendam laudare amplius audeat: neu sobrius vitam fere totam ibi actam traductamque leniter narret: multo minus alienas longe petendas esse disciplinas suadeat: aut insanias et nimium diu jam deridiculas hasce puerorum nostrorum peregrinationes alicui in animum inducat. Cum iidem perfodere montes, sistere fluminum cursus, et in hortulum suum derivare magno mehercle conamine, sed infelice plerumque exitu moliri prorsus videantur. Quanto satius est nobis in ipsa ripa fluminis sedem posuisse, labores, studia, mores tot hominum perspexisse, literarum quoddam inter nos quasi commercium insti-tuisse.

Quæ enim urbs, quæ gens antea unquam in terris, quæ dicam natio, cum rudes adhuc artium essent homines, et dextro Mercurio maxime indigerent, totidem literarum miracula vaticinata est, suo deinde tempore protulit, patefecit, perfecit, quot et quanta ex æde unica hac nostra provenerunt in commune conmodum, atque hu-mani generis decus? Quid vero, Academici, dignum vestris au-ribus, aut iis operibus immortalibus, aut eorum virtuti sempiternæ par ullo modo protuli, aut fortasse prolatus videor? contentus poëne tantummodo nominasse hos viros, cum adæquandæ laudum eorum majestatis spes omnes abjecisset. Baconos scilicet, Neu-tonos, Cotesios, Smithios; Drydenos insuper, Couleios, Barovios; sacerdotes castos, pios vates, philosophos autem poëne divinos, quo ipse aliquando consortio suo proprio dignabitur Deus.

Natura sine disciplina cræca est, et vi ruit sua: illa contra, si a-natura destituatur, manca est et deficit: utraque ubi, dante ac vo-lente Deo, convenerunt, exercitatione tamen opus est et certami-num studio. Ne ipsa quidem Græcia, mihi credite, artibus a Deo armisque abundasset, nisi Lycæa, porticus, sylvas Academizæ se-puisserint: nisi gymnicos præterea ludos, palæstras, circus, theatra

nobili quodam studio frequentassent: agone demum illo Olympico præmia omnibus, justos simul juratos sanctosque judices proposuerint.

Vos tamen fortunatos! si vestra satis nostis ea bona, quos Musæ severiores secernunt populo: quibus doctarum illæ indies præmia frontium novas aliquas palmas decernunt: quorum gravissimis dictis ac factis Pythagoreæ disciplinæ ritu cum silentio stupemus. Utque Cereris aliquando olim arcanis initiati beati dehinc credebantur, vos perinde quietis his ordinibus adscripti de vitæ exitu, et universo ævo spem habetis conceptam meliorem: tantoque rectius doctrinæ illius, quam Neutonus noster toto terrarum orbe disseminavit, fruges ac primitias vos auferetis, qualia Atheniensibus quondam persolvebantur, quanto mentem humanam coluisse pluris est, quam terram inventis plaustris renovasse. Vile solum est Attica: Tibridis arenis prope occlusum est ostium: ipsaque Ægypti Alexandria tot quondam scientiis librisque suis superba, iis omnibus exhausta penitus, incensaque hostiliter, jam inter cineres illas sedens tacita quodammodo vestram opem reposcere videatur: sicut, Nilo jampridem alveo suo egredi nolente, aut aquas illas debitas solito hæsitantius ac pedetentim quidem educente, illa ipsa supplex hæc vestra Ægyptus sole usta tum atque arida Trajanum imperatorem fruges suas reposcebat: Gallia suam sero palmam tradidit: Cartesianum illud somnium evanuit: et in hoc perventum est fastigium, ut¹ non nisi cum mundo interitus sit Neutonus.

Quem vero finem jam faciam? aut quis astantium, ut Graccho olim Romano, ita meæ nunc voci in his rebus statuet modum? quis aliquem mihi suggeret exitum? Bene itaque suo præteritum loco, quo pia sit ac perpetua beneficiorum memoria, et mentibus vestris inhæreat, atque exemplo proposit, Henrici præconium repetatur. Quid simile, quid secundum huic tanto, tam pulcre pieque collocato beneficio inveniemus? aut quemnam mortalium Henrico nostro vel sapientia, vel fortitudine, vel munificentia nisi ex longo intervallo proximum reperiemus? Unicum post hominum memoriam, magni scilicet sapientisque viri Thesei consilium vel ipsius rei nobilitate, vel utilitate cum hoc nostro conferri quodammodo videatur. Qui, consimili olim ratione inita, civitatem Atticam, qui prius sparsim et vicatim habitabant, compulit in unum locum, et congregavit. Quid vero? cum adunatis totius gentis opibus, viribus, consiliis plurimum quidem patriam suam amplificasset, ipsius quomodo capiti et fortunis consultum est? Cum Athenarum arcem celebrimam peregre inde in exilium abiens, et superba illa mœnia sua opera constructa, et ingratam civitatem brevique ruituram respiens precibus, et diris, execrationibusque in perpetuum devoveret.

¹ Non nisi cum toto debuit orbè mori. *Hug. Grot. de Erasmo. Ed.*

Agite vero ad lætiora illa nostra revertamur, gratias, et gratulationes, et pias beneficiorum commemorationes, et festos dies institutos, et coetus hominum celeberrimos, et commune omnium gaudium. Quum stare hanc domum præclaram, tot linguis, artibus, scientiisque ornatam, opibus deinde amplificatam, fama auctam, et novo jam quasi fundamine cœptam iterum strui videant; cum probam docilemque juventutem esse audiant, sapientes senes, et, quod huic tanto populo est instar omnium, magistrum certe in quolibet laudum genere præstantissimum, quidni maximam olim in terris huic ædi diuturnitatem non vanis auguriis, minimeque dubiis tot signorum interpretationibus polliceantur?

Neu quis humanis opibus provenire tot ac tanta hæc arbitretur, Dei, Dei inquam ductu atque auspiciis jacta sunt fundamenta, aucta, perfectaque omnia. Hinc omne principium, huc prospiri referendi sunt exitus.¹ Unus igitur qui ab initio condidit hanc ædem, qui sacrosanctæ et individuæ Trinitatis ei nomen impertivit, conditam imperio suo semper regat Deus.

REMARKS

On 1 Tim. III. 16.

As I live in a remote corner of the country, and have not an opportunity of seeing many new books, I had not till lately the pleasure of perusing some volumes of the *Classical Journal*. I am greatly pleased both with the general plan, and with many particular papers in that work; and it would give me much satisfaction if I could, in any way, add to its value. With this hope, I send you the following remarks on 1 Tim. III. 16, Θεός (or, according to others ὁς or ὁ²) εἰφανεγάθη ἐν σαρκι.

This passage (with the exception of the three heavenly witnesses, 1 John v. 7) has been the subject of more discussion than any other in the New Testament; nor can it, like this latter, be regarded as fully settled to the conviction of Biblical critics. Of the two great editors, Wetstein and Griesbach (both of whom agree in rejecting the common reading Θεός) the one wishes to substitute ὁς, the other ὁ, the first of which appears to have been the reading of the Alexandrian, the other of the Western Recension. That ὁς is the most probable of all the readings, is evident from the margin of Griesbach's edition, where it appears that it is supported (1) by the most ancient manuscripts, (2) by the most ancient versions,

¹ Hinc omne principium; huc refer exitum.—*Hor. Eb.*

² Is not the doubtful reading, ὁς or ὁ, some proof in favor of Θεός? EDIT.

(8) that the ancient *Fathers* could not have read Θεός, as their reasoning, and even their very silence (in those controversies concerning the divinity of Christ, where the common reading would have been expressly to their purpose) strongly militates against such a notion. But, though δέ is, beyond all doubt, the best supported of the three readings, it appears, according to the usual way in which the verse is read, to make something very like nonsense; and Griesbach himself says, *Lectio δέ difficilior est et insolentior ceteris.* Accordingly, the opponents of the reading Θεός (Erasmus, Grotius, and Sir Isaac Newton) have, as appears from Wetstein, embraced the reading δέ or *quod*, in which they have been joined by that great critic himself. This they have been probably induced to do from the difficulty of making sense of δέ, which they ought, in consistency with the canons of criticism, to have adopted, and which has accordingly been adopted into his text by Griesbach.

In a perusal of this epistle some time ago, without any particular view to this discussion, and in a Greek Testament without notes, or various readings, it occurred to me that the difficulty of this whole passage consists in the word ἡμιλογουμένως at the beginning of the verse. This (as the ancient MSS. were written without distinction of words) has been read as one word, *OMOIΓΟΤΜΕΝΩΣ*; whereas, it ought, according to my conjecture, to be resolved into four, *OMOI*, and *ΓΟΤ*, and *MEN*, and *ΩΣ*, which would remove the whole difficulty. Upon turning to the place in Wetstein and Griesbach, I became convinced from the passage of *Fathers* there quoted, that this is the true reading; and I shall shortly state to you my grounds for this supposition, after a few general remarks on the Epistle itself.

The first Epistle of Timothy appears to have been principally directed against the *Therapeuta*, a Jewish sect, concerning which volumes have been written. Since the time of Philo, who gives an account of them at considerable length, they have been supposed to have been so named from the Greek word θεραπεύειν, *to heal* (viz. the soul), nor does it appear that this absurd etymology has ever been disputed. They seem, however, to have been so named, not from healing or pretending to heal either soul or body, but from תְּרוּתָה and פָּתָח, *Thure* and *Patah*, two Hebrew words, which literally signify to *open* or *expound the Law*. In short, the *Therapeuta* were no other than *Expositors of the Law*, and were literally the Νημοδιδάσκαλοι of Scripture. They are described by Philo as spending the whole time, from morning to evening, in the meditation and expounding of the Scriptures, where they pretended to discover a vast number of symbolical and allegorical meanings.'

¹ See Philo *τερπὶ βίου θεωρήσκον*, or Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. ii. cap. 17. "All the interval of time," says Philo, "from sun-rise to evening they exercise

St. Paul's chief object, in this Epistle, seems to have been to caution Timothy against this class of people, who seem to have got footing at Ephesus; and indeed, as Philo tells us, were spread over the whole world, and communicated their instructions both to Greeks and Barbarians. The Apostle begins by ridiculing their absurd allegories, and states, Chap. i. 7, that they had *turned aside to vain janglings, desiring to be Νομοδιδάσται teachers of the Law* (or *Therapeutæ*) *understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.* It appears, that of these *Therapeutæ*, or expositors of the Law, some were females; and, accordingly, the Apostle enjoins Timothy not to permit women to expound or teach, Chap. ii. ¶ 10—15. The *Therapeutæ* were *adversaries of marriage*, and, accordingly, the Apostle mentions that the Bishop should be a *married man*, III. 2. *'They gave up all care of their families,* and he insists on the necessity of the Bishop's *ruling well his own house, and having his children in subjection with all gravity*, III. 4, 5. Similar injunctions are given to the deacons and deaconesses; and then follows the celebrated passage, *These things write I unto thee, hoping to come unto Thee shortly, but if I tarry long that thou mayest know, &c.* And the Apostle, after this passage, subjoins a reason for his anxiety, and the particularity of his injunctions: *For the spirit (says he) speaketh expressly, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing Spirits, and doctrines of devils, speaking lies in hypocrisy, having their conscience seared with a hot iron, forbidding to marry, and to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving.* Against all this the Apostle cautions Timothy, and (with a manifest reference to the Therapeutic old women) he tells him to *refuse profane and old wives' fables*, chap. iv. 7; and states, that so far from there being any merit in *giving up the world, and dedicating one's self wholly to a contemplative life, if any provide not for his or her own, and specially for those of his or her own kindred, that person hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel*, chap. v. 8.

Such is the Apostle's train of reasoning; and it is evident to the most careless reader, that, as it stands at present, the famous passage, *And without controversy great is the mystery of Godliness*, is totally devoid of connexion, either with what goes before or comes after it. Nor is it less evident, from the above remarks, that the

themselves in the study of the Scriptures, which they philosophize and expound allegorically. They consider the words as merely notes and marks of hidden mysteries, which are to be explained figuratively. They have also the commentaries of ancient persons who had been leaders of their sect, and who have left them many monuments of allegorical learning, which they use as archetypes, and endeavour to imitate." The *Therapeutæ* rejected marriage, but there were ancient females among them, as well as males.

Apostle, in what goes before, was speaking *not of the conduct of Timothy himself*, but of the general conduct of the *males* and *females* of the christian community. The passage, accordingly, I would thus read and translate : *Ταῦτά σοι γράφω, ἐλπίζω ἐλθεῖν πρὸς σὲ τάχιον ἐὰν δὲ βραδύνω, ινὰ εἰδῆς πῶς δεῖ, ἐν οἷςθοῦ, ἀναστέρεσθαι, ἥτις ἔστιν ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ ζῶντος, στύλος καὶ ἑδραίωμα τῆς Ἀληθείας, καὶ ὅμοιος Λόγου μὲν, ὃς μέγα ἐστὶ τὸ τῆς εὐσεβείας μυστήγον. ὃς ἐφανερώθη ἐν σαρκὶ, κ. τ. λ.* These things I write unto thee, hoping to come to thee speedily ; but if I tarry long, that thou mayest know what, in the house of God, ought to be the conduct of one who is a church of the living God, a pillar and support of the Truth, and also of the word [or Logos], which is the great mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh, &c.

That this was the reading of the early *Fathers*, I shall now proceed to show, after a very few previous observations. And, first, it is to be remarked, that the whole passage is highly figurative, but is in the usual metaphorical style of St. Paul. In Ephesians, chap. ii. 22, he speaks, also, of the Christian as *a church of God*, and the same figure is employed in 1 Pet. ii. 5. It is remarkable, also, that in this, and the second Epistle to Timothy, the Apostle frequently uses the word *Ιόγος* in a very ambiguous sense, so that it is sometimes difficult to know whether he employs it personally or impersonally. Thus, for example, talking of his own fetters, he says, 2 Tim. chap. ii. 9, *But the Logos of God is not bound*; and in the phrase which he so frequently repeats in this Epistle, *Πιστὸς ὁ Λόγος*, it is occasionally not easy to know whether he takes Logos in a personal sense, or not. The Apostle also uses *Ἀληθεία* in the same ambiguous sense, making it sometimes personal, as it were, (as St. John does, when he says, 1 John, chap. v. 6, *ὅτι τὸ πνεῦμα ἐστιν ἡ Ἀληθεία*), and at other times coupling it with the Logos, 2 Tim. ii. 15, *τὸν Ιόγον τῆς Ἀληθείας*. Finally, it is not unusual with the Apostle to connect two phrases together (as in the above text) which are in some respects synonymous, as when he calls himself in this very Epistle, chap. ii. 7, a teacher of the Gentiles, *ἴν πιστεῖ καὶ ἀληθείᾳ*. I may add, that in the passage which is the subject of discussion, the Apostle, perhaps, was led to a twofold method of expressing himself from his having given a twofold injunction,—that is, both with regard to the conduct of *males* and the conduct of *females* in the church; and it is probable that the meaning of the text is, *But if I tarry long, that thou mayest know what ought to be the conduct of A FEMALE who is a church of the living God, ἥτις ἔστιν ἐκκλησίᾳ Θεοῦ ζῶντος, and of A MALE who is a pillar and support of the Truth*; and from this twofold view of the subject might arise, perhaps, the reduplication *Ἀληθείας* and *Λόγου*.

These things being premised, I shall now proceed to show that the early *Fathers* seem to have read *ὅμοιος Ιόγου μὲν ὃς* in the above

passage; and shall confine myself to the examples in Wetstein and Griesbach. I before stated, that the interpretation which I have given occurred to me without any previous notice of these passages; and, when I saw them, I could not help wondering that when so many great minds have been occupied with this verse, the simple enunciation which I have given should never have occurred.

I. "Ad Christum referri potuit," says Griesbach *in loc.* "hoc dictum a Patribus, sive ὁς legerent sive ὁ ut a Latinis factum hoc esse, jam notavimus. Hinc Christum ipsum nonnulli μυστήριον nominare solebant, et scribere potuit, v. c. Justinus ad Diognet.: ἀπέστειλε Λόγον ἵνα κόσμῳ φανῆ, ὃς διὰ ἀποστόλων κηρυχθεὶς ὑπὸ ἐθνῶν ἐπιστεύθη." The same passage is given by Wetstein, who continues thus,— "Addit I. Millius, ex quibus manifestum est, a B. Martyre lectum θεός. Mihi aliter videtur. Si enim lectio recepta loci istius tunc obversata fuisset animo Justini, quod putat Bengelius, non utique scripisset ἀπέστειλεν, cum θεὸς ἀπεσταλμένος nusquam in scriptura sacra legatur, et vix recte, ut puto, dici possit." Wetstein argues (it is observable) on mere theological grounds, but neither he nor Griesbach seem to have had the smallest idea of *Λόγος*, which must have been read (and, as in the text, without the article) by Justin. II. Cyril of Alexandria (as quoted by Griesbach) *de recta fide ad Theodosium*, thus writes: τὸ μέγα τῆς εὐσεβίας μυστήριον, τουτέστι Χριστός, ὃς ἐφανερώθη --οἷμαι οὐχ ἔτερον τὸ τῆς εὐσεβίας μυστήριον, ἢ αὐτὸς ἡμῶν ὁ ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος ὃς ἐφανερώθη, &c. et ad Regin. t. τις ὁ ἐν σαρκὶ φανερωθεὶς; ἢ οὐλοι ὅτι πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως ὁ ἐκ θεοῦ πατρὸς Λόγος. οὐτω γὰρ ἔσται μέγα τὸ τῆς εὐσεβίας μυστήριον. III. Gregor. Nyssen. in Antirrhet. adv. Apollinar. quoted also by Griesbach, writes thus, τὸ μυστήριον ἐν σαρκὶ ἐφανερώθη· καλῶς τοῦτο λέγων οὐτος ὁ ἡμέτερος Λόγος. IV. Origen (says Griesbach) thus writes in Rom. i. 2, interprete Rufino, Is qui *Verbum caro factus apparuit positus in carne, sicut Apostolus dicit, Quia (l. qui, says Wetstein; fortasse qui, says Griesbach) manifestatus est in carne, justificatus, &c.* It is not unlikely that Origen, or his interpreter, might read ὅμου Λόγου μὲν ὁς, and hence *Quia* instead of *Qui*.¹

From all these passages, quoted from no less than four Greek Fathers, it appears that the idea of the *Λόγος* was constantly suggested to them by this text; and that it must therefore probably, I might almost say necessarily, have been read by them in the manner that I have proposed. The same circumstance will account for the *Western* reading of ὁ, instead of ὁς. Among the Latins the word *Verbum* or *Λόγος* was neuter, and therefore they would natu-

¹ "Ceterum notatu dignum est," says Griesbach *Symbola Critica*, tom. i p. xxxv, Halæ, 1785, "in omnibus operibus Origonis Graecis oraculum hoc Paulinum nunquam laudari, si unicum locum excipiat, ubi legitur, ιησοῦς ἐν δόξῃ ἀναλαμβάνεσθαι λέγεται.

sally read *Quod manifestatum est.* Hence, while δ; was the *oriental* Grecian, δ was considered as the *occidental* reading, because the Latin Fathers continually wrote *Quod manifestatum est;* not that δ was in their *Greek* copies, (though this indeed is the reading of the *Codex Bezae*), but that it was necessary to make the relative *neuter*, as both the antecedents *verbum* and *mysterium* were *neuter*.

I have thus, with all the shortness in my power, given you my reasons for the resolution of the word Ὡμολογουμένως. Several other arguments might be adduced, but those which I have given are of the most importance; nor, perhaps, could what I have further to say essentially add to the evidence already produced. If I am not deceived, I have had the good fortune to elucidate this very difficult text, as well as to throw new light on the subject of the *Therapeuta*—a subject which has been equally controverted with the other, and which, as far as I know, has been hitherto equally obscure. I am, &c.

Coyton Manse, Ayrshire, 24th July, 1815.

J. BROWN.

REMARKS

On the Meaning of the Hebrew Word מִלְחָמָה.

IN the *Classical Journal*, (vol. viii. p. 162,) Sir W. Drummond, in answering the objections of your correspondent S. of Norwich to his philological creed respecting the ancient dialects of Palestine and Egypt, has found it convenient to explain away the Scripture, as S. has somewhere since observed: and he has accordingly endeavoured to show, that the word מִלְחָמָה, translated in our version “*interpreter*,” means merely an “*interlocutor*.” On the meaning of the word, Sir W. D.’s argument very materially depends; and it may therefore, perhaps, not be uninteresting to endeavour to ascertain with precision the true meaning of the word. In the Hebrew text, Gen. xlii. 28, is worded in the following manner: **דָּם** לֹא יִדְעֵי כִּי שָׁפְטֵנִי יְהָפֵךְ כִּי דָמְלָחָם בֵּינְתֵּם, these words have been translated in our common version, “and they knew not that Joseph understood them; for he spake unto them by an interpreter;” but Sir W. D. contends that it should be rendered “and they knew not that Joseph heard, because the interlocutor (דָמְלָחָם) was between them.”

The word מִלְחָמָה is derived from the root מַחַם, according to Si-

monis, (Lexicon Heb. Chald. Edit. Eichhorn Hæc Saxon. 1793, vol. I. p. 864, 8vo.) and we learn from him that Weller in his Treatise on Biblical Philology, *Abhandlungen aus der Biblischen Philologie*, p. 50, explains the word to mean *verba inflectere, inverttere, convertere, mutare*: now an *interpreter* certainly does change the words he interprets; and, as Simonis remarks, a *mockster* (for *ludere, illudere*, is the primary meaning of מילץ) changes the words he intends to burlesque; the meanings therefore are more nearly connected than appears at first sight. What grounds Weller may have to go upon, I cannot pretend to say, never having seen his work; but I do not know any unanswerable objections to his hypothesis.

In 2 Chron. xxxii. 31, we read of מיליצים, “ambassadors,” sent from the princes of Babylon to Hezekiah; now here I think we have rather the idea of *interpreting*, since the Jews, at that period, would hardly, immediately, have understood Babylonish. But here I will allow the sense to be dubious.

The best proof, however, is the use of the derivative word מיליצה: we read, in Prov. i. 6. A man—shall attain—to understand a proverb (מישל), and the interpretation (מיליצה): here cannot signify an “*interlocution*:” it sometimes also signifies a *speech needing interpretation*: e. g. Hab. ii. 6. “Shall not all these take up a parable (מישל) against him, and a taunting proverb (מיליצה) against him?” Every one, at all acquainted with the nature of Hebrew poetry, will perceive, that מיליצה has nearly the same force with מישל, unless he prefer to translate “a parable, and a taunting interpretation against him.” Sir W. D. perhaps, will contend for “a taunting *interlocution*;” to which I shall not object, provided he can make it intelligible.

If the מילץ, who was present (I will not, for obvious reasons, say *interpreted*) at the conference of Joseph and his brethren, merely repeated the words uttered by the parties, Reuben was very bold to make the speech he did, because there was a chance that Joseph himself might hear it: but if this מילץ was really an *interpreter*, and they had reason to believe that Joseph was ignorant of Hebrew, the risk must to him have appeared much less.

If the meaning I have contended for be the right one, שמע will here have the sense of “*understand*,” which, for obvious reasons, I shall not spend time in vindicating.

July 19th, 1815.

M.

REMARKS

On the DEFENCE of GABRIEL SIONITA.

IN the *Classical Journal*, vol. xi. p. 70. a Correspondent has very kindly undertaken a defence of Gabriel Sionita, the editor of the Syriac and Arabic versions printed in the Paris Polyglott. However greatly we may be disposed to respect the motive which has induced the writer to endeavour to shield his client, it may be prudent to pause, until we have examined the justice of the censures which have been passed on Sionita, before we acquit him ; and in consequence condemn the late learned Michaëlis as a severe and unjust judge. It shall therefore be my endeavour to lay before the reader a few instances of Sionita's deficiencies : from which, I conceive, it will be made plain, even to I. T., that no censure has been passed upon him, which is not amply justified by his errors.

It will be conceded without difficulty to I. T., that Gabriel had a very difficult task to perform : but the errors of which he has been guilty, are of such a nature, that they are by no means excused by this task : we complain not of casual error : but we maintain that he has systematically done wrong, and committed faults unpardonable in a critic living in the seventeenth century. I quote Michaëlis as my authority, partly because I have not the Polyglott at hand, and therefore am unable to collect instances : and also, because he has not been either accused or convicted of having falsely accused Sionita.

Speaking of the Arabic version of the N. T. Michaëlis says ;¹ “ Gabriel Sionita has taken very unnecessary pains in *correcting* what appeared to him to be bad Arabic in this version, before it was printed in the Paris Polyglott. A translation of this kind is recommended, not by modern ornaments, but by its genuine antiquity.”

To alter the text of Scripture, particularly of ancient versions, is certainly a very unpardonable fault in a critic : because this completely destroys, or at least very greatly diminishes the authority of the version, as a source of various readings : yet of this fault has Sionita been repeatedly guilty. The value of the Polyglott Arabic is scarcely worth mentioning in a list of various readings : since in consequence of Sionita's alterations, we never can be sure whether we are quoting a various reading of the version, or a various reading made by its editor.

With respect to the Syriac version, Michaëlis² has “ a strong

¹ Introduction to the N. T. vol. ii. pt. i. p. 88. edit. 1802.

² Introd. to N. T. vol. ii. pt. i. p. 15.

suspicion the of this edition," (namely, that) has been altered from mere conjecture, at least many passages in the book of Revelation differ from the first edition, without any reason being assigned for the alteration: and Gabriel Sionita—was not a man on whom we can rely." I do not proceed to cite the censure passed by Michaëlis on his Latin version; because I consider it as an unpardonable act in a collector of various readings to take them from the Latin translations of the Oriental versions, and therefore am not inclined particularly to blame Sionita.

In transcribing or in correcting the Syriac versions, Gabriel certainly has not always paid proper attention to the Hebrew text: if he had he would never have permitted **لَهُ** to pass in Job, xiii. 16. instead of **لَكُمْ**, when the Hebrew has **לְכֶם**, and the Arabic version which was made from the Syriac, reads **بِذِيلِكُمْ**:² nor in Job, xviii. 17. would he have suffered **لَهُمْ** to stand as the translation of **לְהָנִיל**; but he would have printed the word **لَهُםْ** in conformity with the Arabic, which has **الْبَرِيَّة**.³—I might notice his pointing **مَدْعَى** as a singular, when the Hebrew has **מַדְעֵה**, and several similar things: but they are trifling in comparison of what Michaëlis has remarked.

If such, then, be the case, I do not perceive how Michaëlis can justly be said, to have "treated him with merciless severity;" nor can I see any thing in his language deserving of such a censure. He only states undoubted facts; and he closes his remarks by observing,⁴ that "the more he considers him as a critic, the less reason he finds to value him;" and he therefore has omitted in the third and fourth editions of his Introduction, what he had written in the two first editions to the disparagement of Gutbier, who had, in his edition of the Syriac Testament, followed a different system of pointing. To this judgment of Michaëlis, every unprejudiced reader will probably assent: nor does it much signify, whether his edition has failed from his ignorance, his carelessness, or his involuntary haste: the critical value of his labors will in any case be precisely the same: but after what Michaëlis

¹ On these words, Dr. Marsh (Notes on Michaelis, vol. ii. pt. ii. p. 544.) has a note: he simply refers us to Walchii Bibliotheca Theologica, tom. iv. p. 170. and Waltoni Prolegom. p. 89. I believe he appeals to them in support of what Michaelis has said: because where he corrects Michaëlis, he does so at length in a note, and does not content himself with barely referring to other writers.

² Michaëlis Grammat. Syr. p. 6. 4to. Halæ, 1784.

³ Michaëlis Gram. Syr. p. 25.

⁴ Introduct. to the N. T. vol. ii. pt. 1 p. 15.

has said, I cannot easily doubt, that all the three causes were combined.

The “milder sentiments of our Walton,” do not much contribute to make the reader condemn the judgment of the German critic: but in the short paragraph I. T. has quoted, enough has been said, to set Sionita’s pretensions to the character of a sound critic for ever at rest.

The hint respecting candor is inapplicable to Michaëlis, who certainly possessed a greater share of it, than often falls to the lot of critics: and that he was not in general unwilling to defend the reputation of scholars who have been unjustly condemned by their brethren, must be evident to every one, who has read his Introduction to the N. T.; particularly that part where he defends Wilkins from the censures of Jablonski and La Croze,¹ and Emser² from those of the Lutherans in general.

Upon the whole, therefore, it is not possible for me to agree entirely with I. T. in his defence of Gabriel Sionita: and I think it may be doubted whether he has not in some measure, though unintentionally, committed the same fault, which he has censured in Michaëlis.

July 24, 1815.

M

REMARKS

*On some Statements of the Right Honorable
SIR W. DRUMMOND.*

I REQUEST permission to make a few observations on some papers written by your learned correspondent Sir W. Drummond: and I make them, not with the desire of provoking a controversy, but merely from a wish to defend and maintain, what I conceive to be truth.

In an examination of a work of Mr. Bryant,³ we find the following words: “Now the Coptic word for an ass’s colt is CHX (see the Lexicon of La Croze) and it appears from Woide’s Grammar, that the X is often sounded like th; consequently the Egyptian word may be written Seth, an ass’s colt.” If I be not, however, very much mistaken, the words of Woide bear a meaning exactly opposite to that given them by Sir W. D.: they are as

¹ *Introduct.*, vol. ii. pt. i. p. 78. ² *Introduct.*, vol. ii. pt. i. p. 480.
³ *Class. Journ.*, vol. vii. p. 294. (No. xiv.)

follows ; “ **X** pro *g* ponitur **TΕΧΙ**, Tegius. Bonjour Exerc. in Mon. Copt. p. 4. et Apoc. xviii. 10. **УΔΡΧΩ-**
PITHC pro *μαργαρίτης* : Gen. xlvi. 10, 27. **ΧΕΓΕΙ** pro *γεσέμ*, Deut. xxiv. 6. **ΧΜΙ** pro *χι*, nomen oppidi. Hanc literam Græci *accurate exprimere non possunt*, modo per *γ*, modo per *θ*, modo per *σ*, modo per *χ*, modo per *τ* indicant. Vide Jablonski Dissert. viii: de Terra Gosen, p. 81—89. e. g. **ΕΧΙΙΡΣ** ἀθω^ς et ἀτα^ς (hæc derivatio videtur dubia W.) **ΧΕΥΗΟΥΤ** Sebennynthus' nomen urbis : **ΧΙΙΧΓУ**, *γωσεμ*, i. e. terra Herculis : **ҮЕΛХИСДЕК** sæpius in MS. Fidelis Sapientiæ Sahidico, pro *Melchisedek*.—Hebræi eum per **χ** exprimunt.”¹ It is scarcely possible to have more distinct and determinate evidence, that *th* is not the proper power of **X**: “ Græci *accurate exprimere non possunt* ;” and among the various wrong powers they have given it, *θ* is one. The passage that seems to have misled Sir W. D. appears to be the following, which occurs in Woide's Explication of the Coptic Alphabet (Grammat. p. 2.): “ **X** Genga **ΧΩΗΧΙ** *ج* Arabicum, vel *g* Gallorum in *Gique* : vel *Gj* ; vel uti **ת** *blæsum Anglorum* :” here, however, “ *th blæsum*” cannot be *θ*, because Woide would then contradict himself in page 8. : the proper power, therefore, in this case, would approach, in some degree, to that given by some grammarians to the Arabic *ث* namely *ths* : but the right force appears to be that of J or G soft, Arab. *ج* Jim.—In this event, then, Sir W. D. loses a great part of his argument, which is to prove that the Hebrew **ת** and Coptic **CHX** mean the same ; and that when Balaam predicted, that “ a Sceptre should rise out of Israel, —and destroy **תְּבָנֵי שָׂתָה**,”² he merely meant to say “ that the worshippers of Typhon” should be destroyed, “ who was symbolized under the form of an ass.”³

The next particular on which I shall remark, occurs in Sir W. Drummond's Essay “ concerning Egyptian Idols :”⁴ he there says ; “ *Ἄιδοῖν*, in Greek, *comes from αἰδοῖος, venerabilis.*” All the lexicographers, however, whose writings I have seen, derive it from *αἰδός*, “ pudor,” with one meaning of which it is synonymous. In Scapula's Lexicon, *αἰδός* is put first, as the primary root : and in Constantine, to which, however, I have not at present access, if

¹ La Croze (Lexicon Ægypt. p. 164.) calls this city Semanutha ; “ **ΧΕУНОУТ** سمنود Semanutha, urbs Ægypti. Kircher. p. 208.”

² Woide Grammat. Ægypt. p. 8. 4to. Oxon. 1778.

³ Num. xxiv. 17.

⁴ Class. Journ. vol. ix. p. 579. (Supplement to No. xviii.)

I remember right,¹ the note on the word *αιδοῖον*, is closed with an etymology from Clemens Alexandrinus, who clearly derives it from *αιδώς*: and Hederic, who is generally reckoned good authority, says, “*ab αἰδώς*.”—Sir W. D. then, would have done better had he given the same explication of it that he has done of the Latin “*veretrum*,” which, as he says truly, is “*equivalent to PARS VERENDA.*”

Sir W. D. asserts, that “the Greeks expressed the Hebrew *ain* by their own *gamma*, and the consequence has been, that they have written the names wrong, in which the *ain* occurs.”² If I remember right, in some former Essay, he asserted that this was “always” the case: but as I am unable to find the passage, I cannot be positive. The following collation, however, will sufficiently show, that the substitution of *I'* for *Y* seldom occurs: I have not studiously selected my instances, as the occurrence of two or three exceptions from what generally is the case will show: the Greek words are taken from the text adopted by Dr. Holmes, in his valuable edition of the Septuagint:

עַל	על
אָבִן הַשּׁוֹר	אֲבִינְχַוְר
פְּרֻעָה	פְּרָעָה
יְהוֹשֵׁעַ	יְהֹשֵׁעַ
עֵזֶה	עֵזֶה
עַקְרָן	אַקְרָן
קְרִית יְגָרִים	קְרִית יְגָרִים
בְּעַלִּים	בְּעַלִּים
עַשְׁתָּרָת	אַשְׁתָּרָת
בָּאָר שְׁבַע	בָּאָר שְׁבַע
שְׁעַלְּם	שְׁעַלְּם

We see, then, that out of eleven instances, (not peculiarly selected) in two only is *Y* expressed by *Gamma*. Sir W. D.’s argument, that *Pror*, not *Phegor*, is the right reading, remains indeed the same; and if the state of the question be at all altered, it is clearly in Sir W.’s favor: at the same time, it was proper to notice the inaccuracy, which might, perhaps, at some future time, or by some other writer, be employed where a mistake would be more important.

Nov. 5, 1814.

M.

¹ Perfectly correct. Ed.

² Class. Journ. vol. ix. p. 581.

ARABIAN TALES,

ORIGINALLY PERSIAN.

In a little volume bearing the title of *Les Voyages de Sind-bâd le Marin*, which issued from the royal press at Paris, during the year 1814, Mons. Langlès, an Orientalist of very high celebrity, has given

us the Arabic text of *قصة السندباد البحري* *Kissch al Sind-bâd al bahri*, or Story of *Sindbad the Sailor* (so well known through M. Galland's French *Mille et une Nuits*, and our common English editions of the "Arabian Nights' Entertainments,") with a new literal translation, and many excellent notes: besides a preface of thirty pages. In this M. Langlès states his opinion concerning the true origin of these Arabian tales; and would trace them to a Persian source. It has been remarked, he informs us, by several writers, that *Sind-bâd*, *Hindbâd*, and even the names of principal personages in the "Thousand and one Nights," belong to the Persian language, a circumstance which confirms the assertion of a most learned and judicious Arabian author, who declares that those tales were borrowed from the Persians. This author is *Masudi* the historian, and we shall here quote his words—"I have already mentioned," says he, "the books brought to us, and those translated for our use from the Persian, Indian, and Greek languages, and the manner of their composition. Such, for instance, as the work entitled in Persian *Hezar afzanch* (هزار افسانه) or the "Thousand Tales," of which the Arabic paraphrase is called *Alef Khirâset* (الف خرافات) a name wherein *Khirâset* is synonymous with the Persian word *afzanch*, and this work is generally designated under the title of *Alef leilet we leilet* (الف ليلة و ليلة) "The Thousand and one Nights."—It contains the history of a king, his vizier, and two daughters, one named *Shir-zâd*, (شیرزاد) the other *Din-azâd* (دينزاد). Such also is the book of *Tseqil* (or *Tseqiled*) and of *Shimâs* (شیماس) and the anecdotes it relates concerning a king of India, and his vizier. We may add likewise the *Book of Sind-bad*, (كتاب السندياد) and other compositions of the same kind."

This formal testimony of *Musaoudi* renders it unnecessary for me, says M. Langlès, to offer any further argument against the conjectures of some learned men, who have considered the "Thousand and

one Nights," as a work originally Arabian, and perhaps even European. He believes that the names of Arabians, and many pictures of their manners, are interpolations of the translators or imitators; and the conspicuous figure which *Harūn al Rashīd* makes in these stories may arise from his celebrity among the writers of Eastern Romance; equal to that which Charlemagne enjoyed among the old French *Romanciers*.

Under the auspices of *Harūn al Rashīd*, and of the Khaliffs who immediately succeeded him, his sons *Al Amin* and *Al Mamun*, (that is, during the last years of the eighth and the beginning of the ninth century of our era) the Arabs enriched their literature by the translations of Coptic, Greek, Syriac, Persian, and Indian works. But amidst the wars and other calamities that desolated Asia, after the Khalifat of Baghdad had ceased (in 1258) the *Gabrs* or Fireworshippers of Persia, driven by religious persecution from their unhappy country, were scarcely able to preserve some mutilated fragments of their *Zenda-vesta*, the code of their great legislator *Zeratusht* or Zoroaster, and we may suppose that but few volumes, written in the *pahlari* or ancient dialect of Persia escaped the general destruction: although the most interesting or popular works may be still known, however imperfectly, through the medium of translations made by the Arabs.

Monsieur Langlès could not discover that any copy of the *Thousand and One Nights*, nor even of *Sindbad's* story, exists in modern Persian, those in the more ancient dialect having perished, it is to be feared, many centuries ago. He has consulted in transcribing the Arabic text of *Sindbad*, and in translating it into French, two Manuscripts of that noble collection, the Bibliothèque du Roi—an establishment wherein (as we understand from several who have lately visited Paris,) he fills the important office of 'Conservateur des Manuscripts,' in such a manner as to afford the most general satisfaction. He also collated others procured for him by M. Caussin de Perseval, and by his colleague Don Raphael, Professor of Arabic, and by M. Marcel, director of the royal press, who brought three copies from Egypt.

After Sinbad, M. Langlès has added the *Kidalnesa* (كيدالنسا) "Stratagems; Frauds, or Cunning Devices of Women," a title much more happily expressed in French by "Ruse des Femmes." Of this entertaining little story which occupies but nine pages, we shall offer an account in some future Number of the Classical Journal, remarking here that of both works, the Arabic text is, as might well be expected from the superintendance of so able an orientalist as M. Langlès, printed with considerable accuracy and neatness.

MOMI MISCELLANEA SUBSECIVA.

No. III.

1. ALTHOUGH Portus was a useful pioneer in literature, he seems, notwithstanding, to have been but a raw adept in metre. His note on the word *ματενομένην*, in Suidas, shows this clearly enough.

Ματενομένην, ἀντὶ τοῦ νεοττορφοῦσαν. Εὗρον γυναικαὶ ὄρνιθας ματενομένην. *Suidas.*

Εὗρον γυναικαὶ] senarius erit, si legas, ut legendum suspicor, Εὕρον γυναικαὶ ὄρνιθας ματενομένης. In sextā erit anapæstus. In quartā spondæus, loco iambi, quod et alibi [qu. ? where] factum monuimus, vel τὸ νι[j] iam corripietur, ut sit iambus. *Portus.*

The following is the true metrical order of the *Portean* senarius
| — | √ — | √ — | — √ | — — | √ √ — | ; which being pre-
mised, I shall leave it to others to descry the number of blunders
contained in it. This reminds one of Markland's, and, after him,
Brunck's way of marking off the fifteen-hundred-and-eighty-second
line of Euripides's *Phenissæ*. See Porson's note.

2. Quis multā gracilis te puer in rosā
Perfusus liquidis urget odoribus
Grato, Pyrrha, sub antro?
Cui flavam religas comam,
Simplex munditiis? — Hor. Odd. i. 5.

In the fourth line it is not improbable that Horace had in his eye a line from a Greek Epigram quoted by Suidas under the word *Βόστρυχος*. Βόστρυχος πλέγμα τριχῶν γυναικείων. Ἐν ἐπιγράμματι Εἰπὲ τίνι πλέξεις ἔτι Βόστρυχον; I have not seen this adduced as a parallel before.

3. The family of the *Didymi* seems, if we are to believe what Suidas says, to have engrossed a degree of literary talent, or literary industry, unprecedented in the annals of book-reading. One of these, the *spes gregis* of a *salt-seller*, or *bacon-facturer*, or something of the kind, and surnamed moreover *Chalcuterus* or *Brass-gut*, appositely enough, is said to have left behind him the enormous number of *three thousand five hundred* volumes. Διδύμος, Διδύμους ταριχοπώλου, γραμματικὸς Ἀριστάρχειος, Ἀλεξανδρεὺς. Γεγωνὼς [γεγονὼς] ἐπὶ Ἀντωνίου [Ἀντωνίου] καὶ Κικέρωνος, καὶ ἐώς Αὐγούστου. Χαλκέντερος κληθεὶς διὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ βιβλία ἐπιμονήν. Φασὶ γὰρ αὐτὸν συγγεγράφεναι ὑπὲρ τὰ τρισχίλια πεντακόσια βιβλία.

4. Ἐφιάλτης· ἡ εἰς τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνατρέχοντα ἀναθυμίασις ἐξ ἀδηφαγίας, καὶ ἀπεψίας, παρὰ ταροῖς Ἐφιάλτης λέγεται. Ὁ λεγόμενος παρὰ πολλοῖς Βαβοντζιάριος. *Suidas* in *Ἐφιάλτης*.

This distemper is neither more nor less than the *Nightmare*, called by the later Latin writers *Incubus*. No poet has perhaps described this

better than Virgil (*Aen.* xii. 908), as any one will confess, who has felt its influence.

Ac velut in somnis, oculos ubi languida pressit
 Nocte quies, nequidquam avidos extendere cursus
 Velle videmur, et in mediis conatibus ægri
 Succidimus; non lingua valet, non corpore notæ
 Sufficient vires; nec vox, nec verba sequuntur.

The idea was perhaps borrowed from Homer. (*Iliad* X. 199.)

'Ως δ' ἐν ὄνειρῳ οὐ δύναται φεύγοντα διώκειν,
 Οὐτέ ἀπὸ τὸν δύναται ὑποφεύγειν, οὐθὲ ὁ διώκειν.

How much Virgil has improved upon it even the blind may discover.

5. One would imagine that, when Bartolozzi engraved his Venus, he had either seen the following Greek Epigram from the fourth book of the Anthologia, or a translation of it.

Τέσσαρές εἰσιν ἔρωτες· ὁ μὲν στέφος ἀμφικαλύπτει
 Μητρὰς ἡης· ὃ δὲ χεῖλος ἔχει ποτὶ πίδακε μαζοῦ·
 Οἱ δὲ δύο παιζοντι παρ' ἔχεσσιν εἴμα δὲ κρύπτει
 Μηρῷ γείτονα χῶρον ὅλης γυμνῆς Ἀφροδίτης.

6. We remark for the sake of such of our readers as may not have observed it, that the Greek Scholia in Barnes's Euripides abound with interpolations even more than those in his Homer. What wonder indeed, when we see that this foolish Greek Professor has repeatedly stuffed in even Scholia of his own, and affixed his signature to them in mongrel Greek, forsooth! Let the reader only refer to Alcest. 519. and 581. In his note on the Iph. Aul. 77⁵, he refers us with all the gravity imaginable to his *Franciad*, an heroic poem we suspect by the title, but which we never heard of elsewhere, and certainly have never seen. It appears also from Hippol. 525. that this astonishing genius wrote a poem, amatory or otherwise, styled *Esther*. He wrote it probably when the widow fell in love with him.

7. Piscis in disco
 Mihi datur
 Ab Archiepisco-
 po sed non ponatur,
 Quia non mihi bibere datur.

TRANSLATION.

They sent me fish
 In a dish,
 From the Archbish-
 op is omitted here,
 Because there is no beer.

Who wrote these lines? Who translated them?

INQUIRY
 INTO THE
CAUSES OF THE DIVERSITY OF HUMAN CHARACTER,
 IN VARIOUS
AGES, NATIONS, AND INDIVIDUALS;
 By the late PROFESSOR SCOTT, King's College, Aberdeen.

No. VII.—*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 66.*

SECT. IV.

*Of the Opinions of various Writers concerning the Effects
 of Climate.*

THUS, then, it results from the preceding investigations, that climate produces very remarkable and permanent effects upon the human character and constitution. It invigorates or enfeebles the corporeal frame; it braces or relaxes the tone of the fibres; it prompts to activity, or encourages indolence; and thus inspires courage or timidity, and promotes or retards the spirit of enterprise and improvement. It has, besides, a very considerable effect on the headstrong appetite which unites the sexes, which it, in many cases, stimulates to an unwarrantable excess, or chills into apathy.

Such are the effects which proceed, as it were immediately, from the influence of climate, and which seem as certainly to be due to an ardent or frigid atmosphere, as the luxuriancy of the Egyptian palm, or the stunted growth of the Norwegian oak. There are other effects of equal importance, which, though not so obviously dependent upon climate, yet appear, upon investigation, to be fairly ascribable to that source. These are the permanent condition of the female sex, which, by the influence of climate, arises to more dignity in one region of the world than in another. By the same influence also the ordinary occupations, manners, and amusements of a people are much controlled, and become either innocent and rational, or grovelling and vicious. In the last place, the influence of climate is to be detected in the important concern of laws and government, which in some regions have a natural tendency to perfection, while in others they seem doomed to a perpetual debasement.

In ascribing so many important effects to the influence of climate, I may seem to have fallen into the error of which many of the ancient writers, and some of the moderns, have been justly accused, who have been inclined to derive the diversities of human character and disposition from this cause alone. The authors, indeed, who have supported this opinion, are of high respectability, and their names carry with them the weight of authority; but I am by no means disposed implicitly to subscribe to their doctrine, for reasons which will immediately appear.

Among these authors, one of the earliest, and no doubt most respectable, is Aristotle, who states, in the most unequivocal terms, the all-powerful control of climate, and ascribes to this cause alone the proud superiority which his countrymen enjoyed over the surrounding nations in arms, in arts, and in literature. They were, he supposes, placed in that happy temperature which was most favorable to the perfection of the human faculties, and by which they were naturally fitted to hold in subjection the less happily constituted nations around them.

The same superiority which Aristotle ascribes to the climate of Greece is assumed by Vitruvius to the peculiar atmosphere of his countrymen, the Romans. "As," says he, "the planet Jupiter lies between the servid heat of Mars and the piercing cold of Saturn; so Italy, in the centre of the temperate zone, enjoys every thing that is favorable in the opposite climates. It is thus that by conduct in war the Romans overcome the impetuous force of Northern barbarians, and by the vigor of their arms confound the politic schemes of their Southern neighbours. Divine Providence appears to have placed the Romans in this happy situation, in order that they might become masters of the world."

This writer has entered into the investigation of the effects of climate with peculiar copiousness; and the whole of the first chapter of his 6th book is occupied in describing the influence of the atmosphere on the human constitution and temper. "The sun," says he, "where he draws out a moderate degree of moisture, preserves the body in a temperate state; but where his rays are more intense, he drains the body of its moisture. In very cold regions, where the moisture is not destroyed by heat, the body, imbibing the dewy air, rises to a great size, and the voice acquires a deep tone. Northern nations, accordingly, by means of cold and moisture, have large bodies, a white skin, red hair, grey eyes, and much blood. Those, on the contrary, who are near the equator, are of small stature, tawny complexion, curled hair, black eyes, slender legs, and little blood. From want of blood they are cowardly, but can bear feverish disorders well, their constitutions being accustomed to heat. The people of the North, on the contrary, sink under a fever; but, from abundance of blood, they are bold in war."

In another part of the chapter, he adds, "From the thinness of the air and enlivening heat, Southern nations are quick in thought and acute in reasoning. Those in the North, on the contrary, who breathe a thick and cold atmosphere, are dull and stupid." This position he illustrates from the history of serpents, which, in the heats of summer, are active and vigorous; but during the winter become torpid and immoveable. He then goes on to add: "It is not, therefore, at all surprising that heat should sharpen the understanding, and cold blunt it; that the Southern nations should be ready in counsel, and acute in thought; but make no figure in war, their courage being exhausted by the heat of the sun; while the inhabitants of cold climates are prone to war, and rush on vehemently without any fear, but are slow of understanding."

Vegetius accounts for the different characters of men upon principles precisely similar. "Nations," says he, 'near the sun, being dried up

by excessive heat, are said to have a greater acuteness of understanding, but a deficiency of blood; on which account they are destitute of firmness and resolution in war, and dread a wound, as if conscious of their want of blood. The Northern people, on the contrary, removed from the ardor of the sun, are less remarkable for the powers of the mind; but, abounding in blood, they are prone to war."¹

In a similar strain of reasoning, Servius says, in his Commentary upon Virgil's *Aeneid*, "The Africans are crafty, the Greeks fickle, and the Gauls of dull-understanding; all which arises from the influence of climate."²

The limited knowledge and want of experience of the ancients form an apology for their ascribing more to the influence of climate than was justly its due. They were acquainted with but a small portion of the habitable world, and from the imperfect state of their navigation and commerce had penetrated but a little way into the countries of barbarous nations. They were, therefore, unable to contrast the manners of these rude tribes one with another, and to observe those minuter diversities of manner and disposition, which could scarcely be ascribed to the mere influence of their atmosphere. In the ancient world the number of polished nations was inconsiderable, and they had not experienced those vicissitudes of condition, those alternate elevations and depressions, that sudden succession of grandeur and declension, which demonstrate the instability of all sublunary establishments, and the futility of ascribing to permanent causes the temporary superiority of any particular race of men.

But the moderns are placed in a situation which enables them to appreciate more accurately the permanent advantages of any particular region or climate. The page of history informs them that the boasted pre-eminence of the inhabitants of Greece in arts and arms has passed away, and left scarcely a vestige of its existence. The empire of the Romans, too, has long ceased; although Italy, more fortunate than the soil of Athens and of Sparta, has continued for many ages to be the nursery of art and emporium of taste. The moderns, therefore, ought to be aware that there are other causes which affect the pre-eminence of the human character, besides mere physical situation. They ought to be convinced, that even in the most favorable soil the seeds of genius may be choked, and the blossoms of talent withered, if they are not sheltered from storms that gather from without.

Notwithstanding the apparent obviousness of this truth, several writers of great name among the moderns have been strenuous advocates for the sole and paramount influence of climate in determining the human character; while others have been guilty of the opposite

¹ "Oinnes nationes quæ vicinæ sunt soli, nimio calore siccatas, amplius quidem sapere, sed minus habere sanguinis dicunt; ac propter ea constantiam ac fiduciam continuo non habere pugnandi, quia metuant vulnera, qui se exiguum sanguinem habere noverunt. Contra, septentrionales populi, remoti a solis ardoribus, inconsutiores quidem, sed tamē largo sanguine redundantes, sunt ad bella promptissimi."—(*De re militari*, lib. 1, cap. 2.)

² "Atri versipelles, Græci leves, Galli pigrioris ingenii, quod natura elicitum facit."—(Lib. 6, v. 724.)

error, and have denied that climate, unaided by moral causes, possesses any control whatever upon the dispositions of men.

Mallet, in the Introduction to his History of Denmark, adopts the reasoning of Vitruvius and Vegetius, and strenuously endeavours to derive the courage and ferocity of the Scandinavians from the physical influence of their climate alone. "A great abundance of blood," says he, "fibres strong and rigid, vigor inexhaustible, formed the temperament of the Germans, the Scandinavians, and of all other people who live under the same climate. Robust by the climate, and hardened with exercise, confidence in bodily strength formed their character. A man who relies on his own force, cannot bear restraint, nor submission to the arbitrary will of another. As he has no occasion for artifice, he is altogether a stranger to fraud or dissimulation. As he is always ready to repel force by force, he is not suspicious nor distrustful. His courage prompts him to be faithful in friendship, generous, and even magnanimous. He is averse to occupations that require more assiduity than action, because moderate exercise affords not to his blood and fibres that degree of agitation which suits them. Hence his disgust at arts and manufactures; and, as passion labors to justify itself, hence his opinion, that war only and hunting are honorable professions."

Had Mr. Mallet carefully examined the dispositions of the various tribes whom he includes under the title of Germans and Scandinavians, he would have found evidence that some of them are not altogether averse to contemplative occupations, or addicted solely to war and hunting. He would have found the inhabitants of Iceland, for example, from the most remote periods, a pacific and industrious people; affectionate and friendly in their intercourse with other nations, and considerably advanced in the knowledge of letters. According to the best evidence which we possess, the study of history has been a favorite pursuit with the Icelanders from the most remote ages; and they have long been possessed of historical chronicles of great curiosity, the perusal of which forms one of their principal amusements during the tedious nights to which the winter of their climate is exposed.

Even Tacitus, in his account of the German tribes, affords evidence, that ferocity and the love of war, though generally prevalent, yet did not universally obtain among the people whose manners he has so philosophically illustrated. The Chauci, who inhabited an extensive district in the North of Germany, he describes as "a race of people, the noblest among the Germans, who choose to maintain their grandeur by justice rather than by violence. Without the desire of plunder, and free from the apprehension of weakness, they live in quiet and security; they provoke no wars, and are enriched by no rapine. It is (he adds) a remarkable proof both of their power and of their virtue, that without oppressing any, they have attained a superiority over all. Yet, if occasion requires, they are ready to take the field, and their troops are speedily raised."¹

¹ "Tam immensum terrarum spatium non tenent tantum Chauci, sed et implant: populus inter Germanos nobilissimus, quiique magnitudinem suam

The most respectable of all the modern writers who have ascribed to the sole influence of climate the principal diversities of human character, is the President Montesquieu, to whose opinions a more than ordinary degree of deference is certainly due; as there are few authors who have illustrated in so truly philosophical a manner the causes which affect the various institutions and progressive improvements of civil society.

In the second chapter of the fourteenth book of the *Spirit of Laws*, Montesquieu has entered into a minute and even anatomical discussion of the direct effects of climate upon the human body, from which he deduces its influence upon the mind. Cold, he observes, shuts up the extremities of the external fibres of the body, by which their elasticity is increased, and the return of the blood from the extremities towards the heart is promoted. It likewise diminishes the length of these fibres, and thus also increases their force. Heat, on the contrary, relaxes the extremities of the fibres, and prolongs them; it therefore diminishes their tone and elasticity.

On this account, says Montesquieu, the people of cold climates have most vigor. The action of the heart, and the re-action of the extremities, are better performed, the juices are in a juster equilibrium, the blood is better determined towards the heart, and reciprocally the heart has a greater degree of power. This superior force ought to produce important effects: for example, more confidence and courage; a greater assurance of superiority, that is to say, a less desire of vengeance; more opinion of security, that is to say, a greater degree of frankness, less of suspicion, of policy, and of stratagem. Place a man, says our author, in a close and heated place; he will suffer, from the reasons here assigned, a great depression of spirit. If, in this situation, we were to propose to him a bold action, we should probably find him little disposed to execute it; his present feebleness will effectually discourage him. He will fear every thing, because he feels that he can accomplish nothing. The people of hot countries are timid like old men; those of cold climates are courageous like the young.

Montesquieu next carries his anatomical investigations into the effects of heat and cold upon the nervous system, and corroborates his opinions by experiments upon the papillæ of a sheep's tongue. The result is that the people of warm climates, though timid, are of exquisite sensibility, prone to the pleasures of love, and easily transported into the excess of joy or grief. But the people of the North, though courageous and of great bodily strength, are destitute of vivacity and sentiment. "J'ai vu," says this lively author, "les opera d'Angleterre et d'Italie; ce sont les mêmes pièces & les mêmes acteurs; mais la même musique produit des effets si différens sur les deux nations, l'une est si calme, & l'autre si transportée, que cela paroît inconcevable."

malit justitia tueri. Sine cupiditate, sine impotentia, quieti, secretique, nulla provocant bella, nullis raptibus aut latrociniis populantur. Idque praecipuum virtutis ac virium argumentum est, quod, ut superiores agunt, non per injurias assequuntur. Promta tamen omnibus arma, ut, si res poscat, exercitus."—(De mor. Germ.)

These physical causes, according to our author, are amply sufficient to account for the permanent characters of the inhabitants of the different regions of the earth; for the spirit of enterprise and improvement which has produced such beneficial effects in the temperate climes of Europe; and for the want of that spirit which has so long characterised the tropical regions. "If," says he, "with that delicacy of organs, which renders the people of the East sensible to every impression, you join an extreme indolence of spirit naturally accompanying that of the body, and which renders the spirit incapable of any action, of any effort, or any struggle; you will comprehend that the mind, when once it has received impressions, is unable to change them. It is this that occasions the laws, the manners, and the customs, even those which appear most indifferent, as the fashion of dress, to be the same in the East at this day, as they were a thousand years ago."

—(Liv. 14, ch. 4.)

It is sufficiently apparent from the reasonings of the preceding sections, that I am by no means inclined to refuse to climate the most important influence in regulating the natural propensities and dispositions of men. From the examination of facts, the only evidence that is entitled to much weight in an investigation of this sort, I have been led to maintain that the inhabitants of temperate climates are naturally possessed of many important advantages over those either of the tropical or polar regions; that they are, as is maintained by Montesquieu and the other authors just quoted, naturally of greater strength, of more activity, and less addicted to sensual indulgence; nay, that these physical advantages are calculated to produce yet more important moral effects; that they elevate the rank and estimation of the female sex, give dignity and usefulness to the ordinary manners and pursuits of the people of temperate regions, and promote the establishment of good government and equitable laws.

But in deriving these important effects from the influence of climate, I am by no means disposed to consider this as the sole cause of the natural diversity of the dispositions of the various tribes of men. The influence of climate is indeed powerful, but it may be counteracted; its effects are very important; but there are other causes of not less efficacy, which, if they be fairly brought into action, may either prevent the baneful influence, or oppose the beneficial operation of this purely physical principle. It is for overlooking the power of these moral causes that the writers, whose opinions I have been quoting, are censurable. They, perhaps, have ascribed no more to climate than it is really qualified to effect; but they have not considered the important principles by which its operation may be checked, promoted, or altogether counteracted.

Were it true that certain climates are calculated always to produce men of certain talents and dispositions, we should find some favored regions of the earth assuming a permanent superiority, and constantly giving law to the rest. We should invariably find eminence in arts or prowess in arms confined to a certain longitude and latitude. We should have only to consult the map to discover where the sciences are doomed to arrive at maturity; where legislation will be perfected; or

where the warlike spirit will finally produce the most formidable effects. We should have to arrange the nations and countries of the world, less by geographical divisions, than by a scale of temperature suited to express the gradations of permanent excellence.

But the history of nations completely refutes this principle of calculation. It shows that pre eminence, both in arts and arms, has successively belonged to people the most remote from each other, and who have lived under every variety of climate and atmosphere. We find the sceptre of extensive dominion first assumed by the nations of the East, and passing successively from the Assyrians to the Medes, and from the Medes to the Persians. We then behold the genius of the Western nations expanding itself, and the Greeks carrying on a successful contest with the formidable power of the Persian monarch. In Greece it was that intellectual pursuits attained the highest eminence to which they arose in the ancient world. But even the philosophy and literature of Greece were not exclusively her own; by her own avowal they were borrowed from Egypt and India; and thus, like the spirit of conquest, first sprung up in the torrid regions of the earth.

The gradual developement of the genius of Greece, and her advancement from an inconsiderable beginning to the sway of the most powerful nations of the ancient world, forms one of the most interesting objects of contemplation that history affords. But her political reign was short. The conquering progress of Alexander over the Eastern nations, as it resembled in its splendor the dazzling of the meteor, resembled it no less in its fleeting duration. It soon faded away; and the glory of the Grecian name faded with it to revive no more.

The heroic achievements of Greece are succeeded, on the theatre of ancient history, by those of Rome. The conquests of the Romans were more permanent, and more completely combined with the parent state than those of the Greeks. The history of this people exhibits the remarkable phenomenon of a dominion gradually extended from the most trifling commencement over the fairest and most fertile portion of the known world; and at length swallowing up, like a growing torrent, almost every nation and every state in one immense empire. But it was by moral, not less than by physical causes, that victory was so long attached to the Roman arms. While frugality, activity, and public spirit, prevailed at Rome, the commonwealth flourished and increased its power; but when luxury and vice were introduced with the spoils of conquered nations; and corruption took place of patriotism; the Roman glory was extinguished, and the mighty empire was torn to pieces with much greater rapidity than it had been at first consolidated.

How vain then was the boast of Aristotle, that his countrymen were placed in a climate most favorable to the perfection of human talents; and how unfounded the assertion of Vitruvius, that the Romans, by their peculiar situation, seemed intended by Providence to become permanent masters of the world! The soil of Athens and of Sparta, the birth-place of Socrates, of Plato, of Euripides, of Sophocles, and

Demosthenes; the scene of the martial achievements of Miltiades, of Leonidas, of Themistocles, and Agesilaus, has for many revolving ages bowed under the yoke of the most oppressive despotism. It has continued subject to a conqueror equally regardless of its letters, its science, and its laws, and who has effaced almost the very ruins of its ancient grandeur, and obliterated even the titles by which the memory of its former fame might be preserved.

If Rome has suffered a less degrading fate, it has at least long ceased to give laws to the surrounding nations; it has been reduced within its ancient limits, and obliged to compensate by the cultivation of the arts of peace for the loss of military fame. Those Northern tribes, who were stigmatized by the ancient Romans as rude Barbarians, unqualified to excel either in arts or arms, have, in their turn, assumed the sway. They have overthrown the mighty fabric of the Roman power, and erected on its ruins many independent empires, which now vie in celebrity with the fame of ancient Italy and Greece; they have transplanted the sciences and arts of the ancient world into a colder, though not less genial, soil; and have proved that mental superiority is not confined to those regions where the pride of former philosophers had fixed its limits. The prowess in arms, the wisdom in counsel, the philosophy and literature of the ancient world, have travelled even into the Hyperborean regions, and have taken up their abode among a people said by the Romans to be severed from the civilized part of the globe; they are now found to flourish even among the

— penitus toto divisos orbe Britannos.

Thus there is a period of infancy, maturity, and decay in the history of nations and progress of civilization. Where the situation is favorable for the developement of human talents, there we may expect that improvement in arts or in arms will first naturally arise. By the concurrence of fortunate circumstances, a superiority may be gained over the surrounding nations. The spirit of conquest will then predominate, and if not checked by the dictates of reason and prudence, will draw after it the love of pomp, of luxurious indulgence, and at length corruption and complete effeminacy. A hardier and poorer people will then be tempted to attack the tottering fabric of a corrupt empire. They will find its spoils an easy conquest; but they will be exposed in their turn to the degeneracy which so commonly attends the easy acquisition of wealth or power, and to the decay of valor and public spirit which luxury introduces, and by which they become ready to fall a prey to the first hardy invader.

Such are the revolutions to which states and kingdoms are naturally liable; and such have been the principal causes of the declension of the great empires which have in succession figured upon the theatre of history. The contemplation of this fact has given rise to the doctrine, that as in the human body there is a period of infancy and manhood which are necessarily succeeded by decrepitude and decay, so in the political constitution of states, the period of maturity necessarily carries along with it the seeds of future corruption; and the attain-

tment of grandeur and power is certainly followed by feebleness and final dissolution. It must be acknowledged that the history of the world gives plausibility to this opinion, and serves rather to prove that such is the natural progress of all human institutions. But it is yet reasonable to hope that the body politic may be so constituted as effectually to resist, not only attacks from without, but also the sources of corruption which it carries within itself. That an equilibrium may be established among the different jarring interests of the state; and a principle of reform and salutary correction be introduced, by which the tendency to dissolution may be counteracted, and fresh vigor instilled into the decaying members of the constitution.

If, then, there is a succession of eminence and inferiority, of glory and ignominy, in the annals of nations which have long occupied certain regions of the world, it is in vain to pretend that any climate is qualified to give a permanent superiority to the people who enjoy it, or that the beneficial or injurious effects of the soil and atmosphere may not be counteracted by other causes which are not less powerful. It will scarcely be pretended that the climates of nations have changed, as they themselves have risen into eminence or become degenerate; or that their political revolutions have been accompanied by corresponding changes in the state of their atmosphere.

But even this assertion, unfounded as it would appear to be, would not serve to vindicate the doctrine of those who assert the paramount influence of climate. For it were easy to prove, that in climates, altogether similar, nations have existed who at the same period of time have exhibited very different degrees of improvement; and have in their contemporary history, the one attained to eminence in arts and arms, while the other showed no tendency to emerge from barbarism.

In the history of the Carthaginians we have a striking example of a people counteracting, by the spirit of enterprize, the natural disadvantages of climate and situation. Though placed amid the burning deserts of Africa, and exposed to the debilitating action of a tropical sun, they were eminent for their industry and activity. They built spacious and highly ornamented cities; they cultivated and improved all the useful and elegant arts of life; they possessed the most extensive navy of the ancient world, and carried the adventurous spirit of commerce to an extent that has scarcely been rivalled by modern enterprise. They also gave proofs of skill in legislation, and furnished a remarkable example of a republican government situated in a tropical climate. With respect to their valor in arms, the history of their wars with the Sicilians and Romans proves, that in this, as in other accomplishments, they had attained a more than ordinary eminence. The memorable invasion of Italy by Hannibal sufficiently establishes, that if at length the fortune of the Roman arms prevailed, it was not without an arduous struggle that the Carthaginians resigned their liberties, and that they alone of all the contemporary nations were able to wage a contest with the predominating genius of Rome, which for a long period continued doubtful.

While the Carthaginians had thus carried the arts and embellishments of life to a high degree of perfection, the neighbouring nations

on the African coast were sunk in ignorance and barbarism. Nor have they at any succeeding period emerged from the insignificance to which the want of all intellectual improvement condemns them. The only nations of Africa who have risen into any considerable degree of eminence for political wisdom, the cultivation of the arts, or military enterprize, are the Egyptians and Carthaginians; and we may, perhaps, add the modern Abyssinians. The celebrity of the two former has long ceased to exist but in tradition, and that of the latter is at best but dubious. It is, therefore, plain, that the climate of Africa is not naturally adapted to the perfection of human talents; yet even in this unfavorable soil, by the concurrence of peculiar circumstances, arose the mighty rival of Rome, and the emporium of the chief commercial enterprize of the ancient world.

The modern Moors of Africa, who are descended from the enterprising followers of Mahomet, have, under the most scorching sun, retained a great share of activity and acuteness of intellect, and form a striking contrast to the indolent and peaceable negroes with whom they are intermingled. Shaw says of this people, that the small progress they have made in the arts and sciences is not the effect of any incapacity or natural stupidity. The Moors, he says, possess quickness and even genius; and if they do not apply themselves to study, it is because, deprived of every motive to emulation, and continually harassed by their government, they have neither the leisure nor inclination for such a pursuit. The Moors, born slaves, like the greater part of the Orientals, are naturally enemies to every kind of trouble, which has not their personal interest for its immediate object.

The Chinese nation may likewise be quoted as an example of a people who in a sultry climate have, from the remotest ages, been remarkable for their industry and activity; who have carried many of the arts of life to an uncommon degree of perfection; and who have likewise displayed no inconsiderable degree of genius in some of the pursuits of science and literature. This extraordinary people seem to furnish an exception to the political maxim of which we have so lately taken notice, and which pronounces the instability of all establishments of power, or systems of government. From the remotest records of history, their policy, their manners, and their laws, have undergone little change; and though revolutions have taken place in the dynasties which occupy the throne, the integrity of the empire has withstood the shock, and the nation may be said to have remained nearly the same in power, in influence, and in celebrity, from the first details of its history to the present day. To inquire into the causes of this remarkable phenomenon, which affords so strong a proof of the possibility of giving permanency to political establishments, would be entirely foreign from our present purpose.

ENGLISH PRIZE POEM,

Spoken at the Apposition, St. Paul's School, April 13th, 1815.

* PROMETHEUS.

*His Present Misery—Former Happiness—
Despair.*

O HOLY light ! new kindling into morn,
 Whose orient beams a gladdened world adorn !
 Onward thou ridest in thy gay career,
 To clothe with purple spring the golden year :
 But ah ! thy joy-attempered rays impart
 No kindred feeling to my mournful heart ;
 O'er all the world thy radiant glories shine,
 Cheer every cheek, but cannot brighten mine.
 Soft Sleep, who pours his balm o'er every eye,
 Who lulls each bosom and arrests each sigh,
 From my sad brow and aching heart is fled ;
 These chains affright him, and this rocky bed !
 Unhappy wretch ! in charity to man,
 Thy crime, thy punishment, thy woe began :
 Here must thou lie while thunders roar around,
 Rend the scathed oak, and rock the upheaving ground ;
 And as around its head the tempest sails,
 This summit scowls o'er the deep blackening vales.
 Here in primeval ruggedness of form,
 Stern Nature forges the relentless storm,
 Unchains the cataract, directs its course,
 To crush the valley with resistless force,
 And, hoarsely howling, midnight horror flings,
 And pours a saddening gloom, and waves her raven wings!

O ! say, is Justice banished from above,
 Where once she smiled encircling Peace and Love ;
 When Mercy beaming with unclouded ray
 Blessed Saturn's kingdom and paternal sway ?
 Yes ! she is fled, she leaves the accursed place,
 The hateful Tyrant, and Heaven's recreant race.
 So when the thunders roar and lightnings fly,
 And a dread deluge whelms the angry sky,
 Perchance the tempest rouses from the grove,
 Mid myrtle-bowers, a silver-winged dove,
 Far from her nest, 'mid Ether launched, she sails,
 And in sad notes her cruel fate bewails.

When youthful Hope her gay perspective drew,
 Of every form, and every rain-bow hue ;

My mind ambitious soon the task began
 To mould Creation's Lord, and fashion Man ;
 To watch the features, glowing from the clay,
 Rise to my view and my behest obey !
 Yet is this man ? while all bedimmed he lies,
 Unflushed his cheek and unillumined his eyes !
 Oh ! for one beam of pure ethereal fire,
 The clay to warm, to animate, inspire.
 No more ! but swift as flits the viewless breeze,
 And skims the bosom of the rippling seas,
 I gain the throne of Heaven's immortal Sire,
 Where flows the fountain of ethereal fire.
 Pure, vivid Light ! that woke primeval day,
 And over Chaos shed its genial ray ;
 Pure, vivid Light ! that bathed each twinkling star
 With golden beams, and pallid Cynthia's car
 With choicest silver graced, and bade her reign
 Supreme, the glory of the starry plain.
 In earth-born Man that ray divinely bright
 To Reason gave her pure unclouded light.

Methinks I view the fire within him glow,
 Thaw the chilled vein and bid the spirit flow,
 His eyes that stagger with unwonted light,
 And reel with sudden drunkenness of sight,
 He viewed around him all creation shine,
 "The earth," he cries, "the seas, the sky is mine,
 All, all, are mine !" he clasped his hands and said,
 "For me alone the universe is made."
 No more he uttered—bliss congealed his tongue,
 And from his eyes the tears of gladness sprung ;
 Sublime he reared his forehead to the skies,
 As Reason cried, "thy soul must upward rise ;"
 Thy soul still burning with a fond desire,
 To mix with Heaven, and join her kindred fire !
 As when a mother on her infant's face,
 Twined with her charms beholds the father's grace ;
 How mixed with smiles the tears of pleasure start !
 What soft sensations thrill her panting heart !
 Thus my fixed eye surveyed the blaze of light,
 That graced the brilliant dawn of human sight ;
 Gazed on the blush where the soul's beauty shone,
 And hailed the mighty wonder as my own !

I saw fair Nature, gladdening at the view,
 Robe all her beauties with a richer hue :
 When Man first spake, the birds around him hung
 To borrow notes from his melodious tongue :

His feet to lave, a gurgling fountain flowed ;
His touch to greet, a new-born blossom glowed :
Gales swept of harps unseen the trembling chord,
And Echo chaunted—" Hail Creation's Lord !"

But sorrow soon o'erwhelmed this gay serene,
And joy was banished from the gorgeous scene !
As when a cloud whose purpled tints display
The warm effulgence of retiring day,
Charms every eye—transports the wondering gaze
With all the hues that in its radiance blaze ;
But ah ! each tint by darkness is suppressed,
When Phœbus sinks on Ocean's liquid breast.

Arise, ye rocks ; ye oceans, intervene !
Divide my heart from the alluring scene !
Rage, rage, ye storms ; ye tempests, howl around
This rugged rock, and shake the accursed ground !
From your abyss ye phrensic Furies start !
My anger nerve, and blaze within my heart !

Arise ! and bear me to your dread abodes,
Where every pang the tortured soul corrodes !
Where Grief and Misery stalk with steely hands
To execute fierce Pluto's dire commands ;
Where Disappointment counts her tears, that flow
In unison with agonizing woe.

Shall I adore the Tyrant of the skies,
Bow my proud neck, and sue with downcast eyes ?
No ! sooner should fair Cynthia's pallid light
In Heaven dissolve amid the shades of night ;
Sooner should Darkness close the eye of day,
And Discord over all extend her sway.

E'en if the Tyrant should himself descend,
And 'neath his feet the firmament should bend,
While round his brow the storms and meteors fly,
And o'er him blaze the terrors of the sky ;
Though from his chariot-wheel the thunders roll,
That rock the deep and agitate the Pole ;
Though forests crash beneath his ponderous feet,
And seas retiring court a safe retreat ;
Though underneath him mountains crumbling fall,
And dreadful tremors shake the astonished Ball ;
Though all the storms of maddening Heaven be sped,
To crush these limbs, and blast this aching head ;
E'en should this globe 'mid chaos dark be hurled,
My mind shall reign unquelled amidst the bursting world !

JOHN ST. MAWE.

REMARKS

*On the CAMBRIDGE MS. of the four GOSPELS, and
the ACTS of the APOSTLES, marked D by WETSTEIN
and GRIESBACH, in their Editions of the N. T. and
commonly termed the CODEX BEZÆ.*

THE reader of the following pages is supposed to be well acquainted with the history of the *Codex Bezae*, as given by Michaelis in his Introduction to the N. T. and by Dr. Marsh in his Notes on that work;² and therefore I have not thought it necessary to delay him by repeating what has been already so ably performed. He is also, of course, supposed to be aware, that it has been accused, in company with F (the Cod. Augiensis,) G (the Cod. Boernerianus) and the Charomontanus (noted D in the 2nd part of Wetstein's N. T. and in Griesbach's 2nd Vol.) and several other Greek MSS., of representing a text corrupted from the Latin, or, as it is termed by critics, of *Latinizing*: and he is believed to know that this corruption has been denied, by Adler,³ Griesbach,⁴ Dr. Kipling,⁵ Dr. Marsh,⁶ Michaelis,⁷ Dr. Semler,⁸ and Woide.⁹ The charge has been admitted by Matthiæ, and Dr. Middleton,¹⁰ and perhaps by a few other modern critics: the early editors of the N. T. Mill, Bengel, and Wetstein,¹¹ were unanimous in condemning the *Cod. Bezae*.

¹ Vol. II. Pt. 1. pp. 228—242.

² Vol. II. Pt. II. pp. 679—721. I make use of the second Edit. 4 Vols. 8vo. London and Cambridge 1802. The first was printed in 1792, and is not so complete.

³ Vers. Syriacæ denuo examinatae. 4to. Havniæ, 1789. p. 91.

⁴ Symbolæ Criticæ Halle, 1785. vol. i. p. cx. and Prolegom. ad N. T. vol. i. p. lxxviii. edit. 1796.

⁵ In the Preface to his edition of the *Codex Bezae*.

⁶ Notes to Michaelis ut supra.

⁷ Ut supra. (In the 4th edition of his Einleitung in die Gottliche Schriften des Neuen Bundes, Gottingen, 1788. [The work translated by Dr. Marsh,] for in the editions of 1750, 1765, and 1777, he agreed with Wetstein.)

⁸ Hermeneutische Vorberichtigung 12mo. Halle, 1764. vol. III. pp. 126—135.

⁹ Notitia Cod. Alexandrini. Sect. vi. pp. 120—166. ed. Spohn. 8vo. Lipsæ, 1788. He defends here, from the charge of Latinizing, not so much the *Cod. Bezae*, as the *Codd. Greco-Latini*, in general.

¹⁰ Appendix to The Doctrine of the Greek Article applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the N. T. 8vo. 1808.

¹¹ Wetstein was the chief opponent of the *Codd. Greco-Latini*, and the person, through whose means they lost, for a long time, their credit.

It is the object of the following remarks, to show that the Cod. Bezae has been in some places corrupted from the Latin; though not to deny that it contains many valuable readings; to demonstrate, that the truth lies between the extremes of Wetstein's opinion on the one hand, and Dr. Semler's on the other: in short in this, as in most other similar cases, the Critic *medio tutissimus ibit.*

It may be right to acknowledge, that some apology should be made, for differing from so many critics of the first rank: but I trust that the examples to be brought forward will bear me out; and I shall not, I hope, be found obstinate in retaining any erroneous opinion which may be shown to be such: I must also seek refuge in the remark of a distinguished critic of our own country; that "the duty, which we owe to truth, is superior to that which can be claimed by the greatest names, or the most exalted characters." To make apologies, indeed, for appearing on such occasions, is generally of little avail; because they are seldom believed to be sincere: and it were far better ingenuously to come forward with the words of Pilate—*ὁ γέγραφα, γέγραφα.*¹

It is generally contended by the apologists of the Cod. Bezae that it does not Latinize, because it agrees with several ancient versions, in characteristic readings, and also in many, which as far as respects Greek MSS. are *lectiones singulares.* This fact I most willingly grant: but still in my view of the subject, it will not prove that the MS. does not Latinize. I do not regard as Latinisms all the readings in which, though it agrees with few Greek MSS. it coincides with many Latin authorities: nor would I rank in the same class those, in which the Greek text, differing from all the MSS. agrees alone with the Latin version annexed to the Greek text, and which Griesbach has denoted by the abbreviation, *Cant.*, because in many instances, perhaps in most, a single Latin copy may have been altered from its Greek text. The famous reading Matth. iii. 16. *εἰδε τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ καταβαῖνοντα,* which has been termed² an unhappy translation of the Latin, *spiritum Dei descendenterem,* has been well explained by a conjecture of the learned Knittel,³ which, supposing it true, would rescue the passage from the charge of Latinizing: but the great

¹ Dr. Marsh's Preface to his Translation of Michaelis, p. ix.

² I should remark, that the readings I have selected are given on the authority of Griesbach's edition of the N. T. the only collection of various readings to which I at present have access. The references given to the Symbol. Crit. and Semler's Hermeneutische Vorbereitung, I make on the authority of Adler and Dr. Marsh.

³ See Marsh's Michaelis. Vol. ii. Pt. i. p. 230.

⁴ Ulphilæ Vers. Gothica nonnullor. cap. epistolæ ad Romanos, p. 283. Upsaliæ, 1768. or Dr. Marsh's Notes on Michaelis, Vol. ii. Pt. ii. p. 683.

objection is, that in the very same verse the Cod. Bezae has a reading which appears very suspicious: namely, after *καταβαίνοντα*, it adds, *ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*; an addition found only in *Cant.*¹ *verc. veron. germ.* 1. 2. *clar. gat. Mm. Hilar. Auct. de promiss.* In the very next verse too, we have, *πρὸς αὐτὸν, σὺ εἰ* in D. *ad eum; τοιεσ,* *Cant. verc. ad eum: hic est. veron. germ. clar.,* for *αὐτός ἐστιν.* Were these readings single, they would not perhaps prove much, but occurring altogether in the space of two verses, the conclusion is infinitely stronger.² Michaelis objects,³ that “a transcriber, who designedly made this alteration, must have been sufficiently acquainted with the Greek Grammar to know the difference between the masculine *καταβαίνοντα*, and the neuter *καταβαῖνον*, and at the same time so ignorant as not to know that *πνεῦμα* was a neuter.” It cannot be denied that this objection is of great importance: but the ignorance of the writer of the Cod. D. has led him into declining, at Matt. ii. 1., *Ὕπωδης* like *Δημοσθένης*; and at ix. 36. he has formed the Preterite of *πίπτω* like that of *τύπτω*.⁴ Of such a man, it is not very difficult to believe the rest.

That the Cod. D. agrees in very many readings with the Peshito or old Syriac version, and with the readings in the margin of the Philoxenian or Heraclean Syriac, as well as with the Coptic printed by Wilkins, and the Sahidic published by Woide, is a fact very consistent with our hypothesis. Being a very ancient MS. and containing a text much older than itself, it will, of course, contain a great number of valuable readings, or at least many which are found in those authorities. But still, the Cod. Bezae has a great number of readings which are peculiar to itself, and to the old Latin versions, or which are found only in them and in the Armenian version, which, it is notorious, has been once, if not twice, corrected or corrupted from the Latin.⁵ It has indeed been denied by Dr. Griesbach,⁶ that the Armenian does Latinize, because it often agrees with the quotations of Origen: Michaelis, however, replies,⁷ that, “not to mention that the Latin version itself coincides with Origen in many important readings, it cannot be inferred from the coincidence even of a

¹ I use the abbreviations employed by Griesbach.

² Middleton, p. 691. ³ Introd. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 230.

⁴ For these instances I am indebted to Dr. Middleton, p. 686: Griesbach, who generally quotes only the readings which make some alteration in the sense, has not noticed them.

⁵ Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 102. This correction undoubtedly took place about the year 1250, in the time of Haitho, or rather Hethom: the second is supposed to have been made by Uscan, Bishop of Erivan, when he printed the version at Amsterdam in 1666.

⁶ Symb. Crit. T. i. p. 77.

⁷ Introd. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 103.

great number of examples that Hethom made no alterations;¹ to this it may be added, that probably the readings it has in common with Origen existed before the time of Haitho. That he left many ancient readings in the Armenian text, is highly probable, from the circumstance, that it still has *Jesus Barabbas* in Matth. xxvii. 16, 17. an addition found in three MSS. and the Jerusalem Syriac, and some few copies of Origen (*Hom. xxxv. in Matt.*) besides the scholia attached to many MSS. and which is countenanced by an ancient tradition of the Syrian church.² This reading is found in no Latin MS. On the other hand, he had the imprudence to interpolate 1 John v. 7., which, whether it be genuine or not, certainly never formed a part, either of the Armenian or any other oriental version.—At the same time, it should be confessed, that the Arm. seldom agrees with D, where its reading is supported only by the Latin authorities.

Dr. Middleton in his Appendix has given a very useful collation of the Cod. Bezae in Matt. v.—xii. and as a supplement to what he has done I offer to the reader the following collation of the remainder of the book. I have confined myself to instances, in which D agrees with Latin authorities only; to instances of agreement between D, the Latin versions, and the Armenian; to readings found only in D. Cant.; and *lectio singulares* of D.—I have omitted several readings, which, according to Griesbach, belong to the above classes, because I have carefully compared my whole collation, with the Coptic and Sahidic versions, and found several instances in which they supported the Latin readings, though Griesbach has omitted to note their evidence: and I have made it a rule to produce none which do not fall strictly under the foregoing heads.—Griesbach's notation of the authorities has been followed: the mark + denotes the addition of a word or sentence; and = the omission.

Matthew xiii. 1. ἀπὸ τῆς οἰκίας] = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. 2. || xiii. 13. αὐτοῖς λαλῶ] λαλεῖ αὐτοῖς D* ἐλάλει αὐτοῖς D** || xiii. 14. λέγουσα] + παρεύθητι, καὶ εἰπὲ τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. D. cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. colb. germ. 1. alii. || xiii. 17. εἶδον] ἴδυνθησαν ιδεῖν D. cant. || xiii. 23. δις δῆ] τότε. D. cant. verc. veron. colb. clar. || xiii. 49. αἰῶνος] κόσμου D. || xiv. 2. αὐτοῦ] + μήτι D. (St. β.)² cant. veron. brix. clar. germ. 2. Mm. gat. || xiv. 3. φιλίππου] = D. Vulg. cant. verc. corb. germ. 1. colb. for. || xiv. 8. ἐν πίνακι] = D. cant. || xiv. 14. αὐτοῖς] περὶ αὐτῶν. D. ||

¹ See Adler, Verss. Syr. p. 172, or the Class. Journal, Vol. ix. p. 225. No. XVII.

² The Cod. Stephani β. is no other than the Cod. Bezae. See Marsh's Michaelis Vol. ii. Pt. i. p. 236. Pt. ii. p. 688. sqq.

xv. 11. κοίνοι] κοινωνεῖ. D.³ *communicat* Cant.* colb. (*semel.*) Tert. Hier. Aug. Sic *bis et vs.* 18, 20. || **xv.** 14. αὐτοὺς] τοὺς τυφλούς. D. cant. || **xv.** 22. αὐτῷ] ὅπλων αὐτοῦ. D. cant. || **xv.** 24. πρόβατα] + ταῦτα. D. cant. || **xvi.** 2. αὐτοῖς] = D. cant. verc. colb. germ. 1. || **xvi.** 4. καὶ μοίχαλις] = D. cant. verc. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. Prosper. || **xvi.** 5. οἱ μαζηταὶ αὐτοῦ] *Post ἐπελάθοντο ρομιντ* D. It. (exc. brix. germ. 2. for. et gat.) || **xvi.** 16. ζῶντος] σώζοντος D.* cant.* || **xvii.** 1. Καὶ prius] + ἐγένετο. D. It. (exc. brix. for.²) || κατ' ἵδιαν] λίαν D. cant. || **xvii.** 12. οὐτα καὶ ὁ οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθερώπου μέλλει πάσχειν ὑπ' αὐτῶν] *In finem commat.* 13. *rejiciunt* D. cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. colb. germ. 1.³ || **xvii.** 25. ὅτε εἰσῆλθεν] εἰσέλθοντι D. || **xviii.** 16.

* Could this error have arisen in the Greek? The following conjecture appears to account for it. *Koīnō* sometimes means *communico*, e. g. Φέρε, κοίνωνος μῆνον εἰς ήμέας Eur. Iph. in Aul. 44. but in this place it signifies *iniquino, polluo*. The old Latin translators rendered it here, improperly, by *communico*: the transcriber, or rather the compiler of the *Cod. Bezae*, consulted the Latin vers. and, without any further consideration, altered *κοίνοι* to *κοινωνεῖ*, which never means *polluo*.

* For the *Cod. Foro-juliensis*, an ancient Latin MS. printed by Blanchini in his *Evangeliarium Quadruplex Romæ*, 1749, contains merely the corrected text of Jerome, and does not belong to the old Latin version: *ἐγένετο*, is therefore the reading of all the MSS. of what is termed the *Italic* version, with the exception of the *Cod. Brixensis*. See Marsh's *Michaëlis Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 109.* and Dobrowsky, Fragment. *Pragense Evangel. Marci. Prag. 1788.*

³ How can this transposition be accounted for? I have not access to any of the old verss. published by Blanchini; but from the reading of the Vulg. I am induced to offer the following conjecture. The passage in that vers. is thus worded: *Sic et filius hominis passurus est ab eis*: and the final clause of the 13th verse, περὶ Ἰωάννου—*síτεν αὐτοῖς*, is rendered; *de Johanne—dixisset eis*. Now the transcriber of the Lat. MS. from which the others were transcribed after he had written *voluerunt*, by which *ἡθέλγαν* is rendered, cast his eye on the 13th verse and wrote as far as *dixisset eis*: on examining his transcript he perceived his mistake, and added in the margin the words he had omitted in v. 12: subsequent transcribers admitted this marginal addition into the text, but in the wrong place. From one of these copies the *Cod. Bezae* was corrected.—If it should be objected, that the transposition makes absolute and incorrigible nonsense of the passage, and that therefore the *Cod. Bezae* would hardly have been so corrected; it may be replied, that the correction might as well be made there, as the transposition occur in the Lat. MSS., the transcribers of which seem to have understood what they wrote, and would therefore, it might be thought, equally perceive the absurdity. Besides we have sufficient proof, that the writer of the Cod. D. was, as Wetstein says, “*καλλγραφεῖς, quād vel Graecē vel Latina littera peritor.*” Indeed, the conjecture of Knittel to explain the reading ~~οὐτα~~ *Matt. iii. 16. supposes* a great want, both of accuracy and of knowledge.—The transposition could not have arisen from an *homoioteleuton* in the Greek; because there we have *αὐτῷ* and *αὐτοῖς*. The question might have been examined with greater certainty, had I had the use of the *Evangeliarium* of Blanchini: but if the conjecture be grounded, it is, I

= D. Cant. Aug. *semel*. *In aliis locum mutat.* || xviii.
 25. ὁ χύγος αὐτοῦ] αὐτοῦ = D. Cant. verc. for. germ. 2. harl. em-
 mer. Hier. Lucifer. || xviii. 26. σοι] = D. Cant. veron. corb. 1. 2. ||
 xviii. 33. οὐκ ἔστι] + οὐν D. Arm. Vulg. It. (exc. for.) Aug. || xix.
 1. ἐτέλεσται] ἐλάχληται D. It. (exc. brix. germ. 2. clar. Mm. for.)
 Hilar. || xix. 10. τοῦ ἀνθρώπου] τοῦ ἀνδρὸς D. Arm. (*ut videtur*)
VIRI, It. (exc. brix. for. germ. 2.) Amb. Op. imp. Ambrosiast. ||
 xix. 25. ἐξπλήσσονται] + καὶ ἐφβρήσονται D. Cant. verc. veron. corb.
 germ. 2. Mm. corb. 2. Hilar. || xix. 29. ἡ πατέρα] = D. Cant.
 veron. corb. 1. 2. Hilar. Paulin. || xx. 10. πλείονα] πλείω D. || xx.
 28. πολλῶν.] + ² ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι, καὶ ἐκ μείζονος

should conceive, an irrefragable proof, that the *Cod. Bezae* does latinize, at least in some instances.

¹ The difference between the two readings is greater than may appear at the first view: ἄνθρωπος signifying *a man* generally, like the Latin *homo*; while ἄντρος means *a husband*, as the Latin *vir*.

² This is a very long interpolation, though not, as will be shown, a singular one, in the *Cod. Bezae*. It does not seem likely to have taken its rise in the Greek. I. The Italic version, (in all the MSS. of which it is found, with little variation,) certainly existed at a period considerably prior to the *Cod. Bezae*, even allowing to that MS. the greatest antiquity for which its advocates contend. II. The Latin versions made before the time of Jerome fell into great confusion, on account of the liberties taken with them by transcribers, who, as we are told by St. Jerome, (as quoted by Michaelis, Introd. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 119.) made, rather *harmonies* of the Gospels, than *transcripts* of them: hence, this passage was probably interpolated from Luke xiv. 8. sqq. though evidently in the wrong place. From hence I conceive it to have been admitted into the *Cod. Bezae*: the transcriber of which, being a member of the western church, probably thought he really improved the text by so doing. If we consider the attachment which Augustine (a man of more information probably, and who therefore was more likely to entertain moderate opinions, than the writer, or rather the compiler of the *Cod. Bezae*.) showed to the old Italic version, by entertaining a great jealousy of Jerome's endeavours to amend it; we can hardly be surprised, that the writer of our Codex should think the version paramount to the text, and should now and then correct the latter by the former. III. If we translate closely, the old Lat. vers. into Greek, we shall have exactly the reading of the *Cod. Cantabrigiensis*: and we have seen already in Matt. xv. 11. and xvii. 12. some readings which look very like retranslations. IV. This reading seems to have extended very widely into the old Lat. vers. because we find it in the Anglo-Saxon vers. which according to Michaelis (Introd. Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 158.) was made from the old Lat. and not from the Vulg. V. Had this addition arisen in the Greek, we should have expected to find it in some other Gr. MSS. at least in some one of those which harmonize with the *Cod. D.*; but it is found in the *Cod. Bezae* alone. VI. It is true that the same addition is found in the margin of one MS. of the Philoxenian version; (see the Syriac text in Adler's *Versus. Syr.* p. 90.) and that it is there said to have been found in *exemplis Gracis*. (Ἰακὼβος) There is, however, reason to think that the *Cod. D.* was one of the MSS. used by Thomas of Harkel, the Editor of the vers. when he collated it with Greek

μέττον εἶναι εἰσεχόμενοι δὲ, καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι, μὴ ἀνακλεῖ-
νοθαι εἰς τοὺς ἔξεχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξύτερος σου ἐπέλη, καὶ προσ-
ελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτως εἴπῃ σοι, ἔτι κάτω χώρει καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ.
ἔτι δὲ ἀναπέσης εἰς τὸν ἥπτονα τόπουν, καὶ ἐπέλη σοῦ ἥπτων, ἕρει σοι ὁ
δειπνοκλήτως· σύναγε ἔτι ἄνω καὶ ἔσται σοὶ τοῦτο χρήσιμον. D. *Vos autem queritis de minimo* (*pusillo verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. colb. clar. Leo M. modico emmer.*) *crescere, et de magno* (*maximo emmer.*) *minui, (et de majore minores fieri s. esse verc. corb. 1. 2. colb. clar. Leo M. Juv. et de minore majores fieri s. esse veron. germ. 1. et de magnis majores esse* cod. S. Andreæ secus Avenio-
nem. Leo M. alicubi) *Introeuntes (intrantes verc. veron. alii)* *autem et rogati cœnare (ad cœnam verc. veron. alii)* *ne discubueritatis (nolite recumbere) in eminentibus (superioribus) locis, ne forte dignior (clarior) te superveniat et accedens cœnæ invitator (qui ad cœnam vocavit te) dicat tibi: adhuc deorsum (inferius) accede; et confundaris (et erit tibi confusio.) Si autem discubueris in minimum locum, (in loco inferiori) et superveniat minor (humilior) te, dicet tibi invitator cœnæ (qui ad cœnam vocavit te) collige adhuc superius, (accede adhuc sursum, s. superius) et erit tibi hoc utile (utilius). Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. germ. 1. 2. colb. clar. emmer. *Alii Codd. latt. 5. apud WETST. Vers. Sax. Cod. Syræ. p. ASSEMANI 1. in marg. (hac addita nota: "hæc quidem in exemplis antiquis [sc. Syriacis] in Luca tantum leguntur cap. 53.; inveniuntur autem in exemplis græcis hoc loco, quamobrem nos ea hic apposuimus.) Hilar. Leo M. Juv. || germ. 1. non habet partem posteriorem: INTROEUNTES; contra vero germ. 2. et Hilar. omittunt partem additamenti priorem. || xxi. 7. ἐπίνω αὐτῶν] ἐτι αὐτῶν. D. Cant. verc. veron. brix. corb. 1. 2. clar. vulg. ms. Origen ms. scel. Op. imp. Juv. || ἐπεκάθισαν] ἐκάθητο D. || xxi. 18. ἐκαθάρισαν] παράγων.] D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. colb. clar. Hilar. || xxi. 24. ὅν] = D.* cant. corb. colb. clar. || xxi. 32.**

MSS. in the library of Alexandria: (see Adler *Vers. Syr.* p. 180. and his remarks p. 188.) and this is not a little corroborated by the circumstance, that the *Cod. Cant.* and the margin of the *Philox. Syr.* contain the readings of the Alexandrine edition. But after all, it is not certain that Thomas of Harkel found it in *EXEMPLIS GRÆCIS*, or that he meant to express the plural; since the Syriac words being written without vowel points, will express in *EXEMPLIO GRÆCO* if the Ribbūi be discarded, and they be read *لُكَة لُكَة*: this Adler himself remarks. (p. 91. note 39.) The testimony of the *Philox. vers.* therefore, will not prove the *Cod. D.* not to have been interpolated from the Latin. VII. Matthæi thinks it arose from a scholion in some Greek copy: but to this it may be objected, that the practice of writing scholia in Gr. MSS. hardly commenced so very early, as this reading must have existed, which obtained a most complete possession of all the MSS. of the old *Lat. vers.* If all this be considered, we shall hardly think that this reading arose in the Greek.

οὐ] = D. Cant. (colb. *videntes hac, pœnit.* Sed *videntes, pœnit.* ceteri latt.) || xxi. 39. ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπελῶνος, καὶ ἀκτι-
τειναν] ἀπέτειναν, καὶ ἐξέβαλον ἔξω τοῦ ἀμπ. D. Cant. veron. verc.
clar. corb. 2. colb. Mm. Sax. Lucif. Juv. || xxii. 5. ὁ μὲν—ὁ δὲ] et,
et postea αὐτῶν D. Cant. veron. colb. corb. 2. clar. Iren. Lucif. ||
xxii. 7. Ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς] ἐκεῖνος^{τῷ} βασιλεὺς ἀκούσας D. Cant.
veron. Lucifer. item (addito autem) verc. colb. corb. 2. || xxii. 19.
δῆσαντες αὐτοῦ πόδιας καὶ χειρίσας ἄφατε αὐτὸι] ἄφατε αὐτὸν πόδιαν καὶ
χειρῶν καὶ βάλετε αὐτὸν (omisso δῆσαντες) D. Cant. verc. veron.
colb. corb. 2. clar. Iren. Hilar. semel. Lucif. Donat. in collat. car-
thag. *Tollite eum ligatis pedibus et manibus et mittite eum,* corb.
1. Ambrosiast. Hier. Victor. tun. || xxii. 15. ὅπως] πᾶς D. Cant.
brix. || xxii. 17. *Eἰτε οὖν ἡμῖν]* = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 1. 2. ||
xxii. 37. *Ιητοῦς]* post αὐτῷ ponit D. Vulg. It. || xxiii. 34. *πέδης ὑμᾶς]*
= D. Cant. || xxiv. 17. *αὐτοῦ]* = D. Cant. verc. veron. corb. 2.
Cypr. Iren. Hilar. Op. imp. || xxiv. 24. *πλαυῆσαι]* πλαυῆγας D.
Vulg. for. veron. germ. 1. Cypr. *seducantur . . . electos,* Cant. ||
xxiv. 30. ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ] τοῦ ἐν οὐρανοῖς D. Cant. || xxv. 20. *ἐκέρδησα*
ἐπεκέρδησα D. Vulg. It. || xxv. 21. ἐπὶ prius] ἐπεὶ ἐπ' (etiam vs. 29.)
D. Arm. Vulg. It. Patr. latt. || xxv. 28. δέκα] πέντε D. Cant. qui-
quaque duplicavit. Hilar. || xxvi. 55. ἐξήλθετε] ἥλθατε D. It. exc.
corb. 1. germ. 1. brix. || xxvi. 60. πολλῶν φευδομαρτύρων προσελθό-
των οὐχ εὑρον] τὸ ἐξῆς. καὶ πολλοὶ προσῆλθον φευδομάρτυρες, καὶ οὐχ
εὗρον, τὸ ἐξῆς. D. sequentia. *Et multi accesserunt falsi testes, et*
non invenerunt rei sequentia (f. 1. *reum, sequentia*) Cant. || οὐχ
εὑρον prius] non invenerunt exitum, corb. 2. non inv. exitum rei
clar. || οὐχ εὑρον posterius] non invenerunt culpam brix. non
inven. quicquam in eo s. in eum colb. corb. 2. clar. non inv. exi-
tum rei. verc. || xxvi. 71. ἀλλῃ] + παιδίσκη. D. Vulg. veron.
verc. colb. corb. 2. clar. Mm. gat. + γυνὴ τις Arm. || xxvi. 73.
δῆλον σὲ πτεῖ] ὅμοιαζε. D. veron. verc. clar. colb. corb. 2. || xxvii.
1. ἐλαβον] ἐποίησαν. D. Verc. brix. colb. gat. || xxvii. 32. *κυρήναιον*
+ εἰς ἀπάντησιν αὐτοῦ. D. Sax. cant. veron. verc. colb. clar. corb.
2. gat. Mm. germ. 2. luxov. harl. || xxvii. 66. *τῆς κουστωδίας]* φύλα-
κας et τῶν φυλάκων. D.* cant. veron. verc. brix. colb. germ. 1.
corb. 2. foroj. Aug. || xxviii. 7. *ἐπὶ τῶν νεκρῶν]* = D. Arm. Vulg.
It. (exc. brix. foroj. colb. corb. 2. germ. 2. gat.)

The above collation contains the chief readings in which the *Cod. Bezae* differs from the received text, either alone, or accompanied with other Latin authorities. It would be too much to assert, that all the readings above quoted, or even the major part of them, owe their origin to the influence of the Latin; nor has this been assumed: but that some do, cannot, I think, easily be doubted.

The *Cod. Bezae*, sometimes, though not frequently, departs

the received text, in company with the Persic version printed in the London Polyglott, either singly, or in company with the Latin. At the first view, it may appear extremely improbable that the Persic should have been altered from the Latin, particularly when Michaelis,¹ with some other learned critics, have contended that it was translated from the Syriac. If we had no other extracts from this version but such as have been given by Griesbach, it might, perhaps, be difficult to bring home the charge: but Dr. Adam Clarke, a writer distinguished by his knowledge of the Persian language, has given in the General Introduction to the N. T. prefixed to his edition of the Bible with notes,² a very ample account of this version, from which I am able to give the following instances. It will be clearly seen that it was made by a *Roman Catholic*, who has even falsified the text to support his doctrines. E. g. mitigation of punishment is promised to Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment: Matt. xi. 22. "Now I say unto you, that in the day of judgment, to Tyre and Sidon, there shall be REPOSE, which shall not be to you:" there is a Catholic saying about Hell: Mark ix. 46. the words, "where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," in the Persic is translated by, "*because from thence liberation is impossible*:" Prayer for the dead is noticed in Luke, vii. 12. "he saw a dead man, whom they were carrying out with PRAYER and lamentation:" the merit of good works, for the purchase of the remission of sins is taught Luke vii. 47. and xvi. 9. "*as a RECOMPENSE for what she has done, her sins which are many, are forgiven*, for that very cause that *she was worthy of much, or, has much merit: but little shall be forgiven to him who has little merit*:" the doctrine of supererogation is glanced at, Luke xix. 9. "Jesus said,—to-day—there is a great salvation to this house, because this man is of the sons of Abraham;" and the merit of martyrdom is spoken of Matt. xxvii. 52. "*the bodies of many saints who had suffered MARTYRDOM rise.*" That a translator of this kind employed the Latin version, is almost a thing of course: and Dr. C. after attentively reading the version twice, is of opinion that it was made directly from the Vulgate: but this will not agree with a phenomenon mentioned by Michaelis,³ that Syriac words are retained and a Persic interpretation added. However, allowing that it was made from the Syriac, still it might have been corrected in some measure from the Vulgate: for we read that Hebedjesu Bishop of Sigara, who lived in the year 1295, went to Rome to abjure Nestorianism:⁴ and

¹ Introduction Vol. II. Pt. 3. p. 105.

² Page 17.

³ Introd. Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 105.

⁴ See Echellenensis Praefat. ad Hebedjesu Catalog. Lib. Chaldaeorum, p. Roma. 1653. or the Class. Journal, Vol. IX. p. 189.

of the four Gospels, &c.

it was about this time, that the Persian version probably was made, or a little before it : Dr. C. places it in 1341. This sufficiently establishes the fact, that an ecclesiastical intercourse between the members of the Roman and Arabian Churches of that period subsisted. These premises being established, the inference follows of course.

The object of the present essay, however, is not so much to prove the corruption of the Cod. D. from the Latin in particular, as its actual corruption from some source or other. That the MS. contains many readings peculiar to itself, and also abounds with additions, is a fact well-known and admitted, even by its warmest advocates : thus for example, besides the remarkable addition noticed above in the collation on Matt. xx. 28., it contains several more, equally remarkable : it would take up too much time, as well as paper, to cite them at full length ; and I shall therefore content myself with referring the reader to Griesbach's edition of the Greek Testament under the following passages : Luke ii. 39 ; iv. 31 ; xi. 2, 30 ; xxiii. 54 ; xxiv. 1. John vi. 56 ; xii. 28 ; xvii. 11. Act. Apost. vi. 11 ; xv. 29 ; xvii. 15. These examples I have collected by merely turning over the leaves of Griesbach : I have observed many more at different times ; but, as I neglected to note the passages, I cannot give more instances : these, however, will be quite sufficient for any reader who will take the trouble attentively to consider them.

The true opinion respecting this MS., therefore, seems to be as follows : the original MS. which formed the basis of our Codex, was of the Alexandrine edition ; and contained the valuable readings which we find in that edition : this fell into the hands of some member of the Western Church, who, entertaining a high opinion of the Latin version, noted in the margin, in Greek, many of its readings : it was afterwards transcribed by some one, who added a Latin version, and received into the Greek the various readings noted by his former possessor ; to these he added a few scholia, which he found in the margin of that or some other MS. ; and being, as Wetstein says, more skilled in calligraphy than in Greek, he added some blunders of his own. This is probably a true sketch of the history of this MS. ; and will account for its frequent coincidence with the three Egyptian versions, with the margin of the Philoxenian Syriac, and with the MSS. of the Alexandrine

¹ "Notissimum est," says Dr. Kipling, the learned editor of the MS., "Beze Codicis Textum non modo scholiis hic illic sedari, verum etiam spuriis quibusdam amplificari. *Præf.* p. 5. See also Michaëlis, *Introd.* Vol. II. Pt. i. p. 235. though he does not admit that it *Latinizes*.

dition. Michaelis himself insists,¹ that it is a Codex eclecticus, and that "the transcriber," (he should have said the possessor, for the writer could not easily have made, himself, the variations found in the MS., being too ignorant,)—"acted like a critic, and corrected the text from the best helps which he could procure, and derived assistance from many ancient MSS., some of which had admitted scholia into the text, and at times to have ventured a critical conjecture." This being the case, if the corrector was a member of the Western Church, he might, and probably would, use the Italic version as an assistance. Dr. Marsh, indeed, thinks,² "if so eminent a critic as Wetstein had not advanced the addition, it would seem absurd, where the Greek occupies the first page, the Latin the second, and the latter is annexed to the former, as a mean of understanding it, to imagine that the readings of the original were adapted to those of the translation." But why may not the Latin have been used also as a critical *subsidium*? If, as Dr. M. believes,³ the reason, why the Cod. D. so frequently agrees with the Latin, be, that the MSS. from which the Latin versions were made, come nearer to it in point of time, than to those Greek MSS. from which the Codex Bezae differs: if the authors of these Latin versions found in the Greek MSS. from which they translated, the readings which are common to them, and to the Cod. Bezae: if this very agreement, instead of showing these readings to be spurious, is a strong argument that they are ancient and genuine: then must we without hesitation receive into our Greek text the addition at Matt. xx. 28., though evidently in the wrong place. Because it is supported by a great majority of the Latin authorities. But Jerome assures us that the Italic version was much corrupted; and therefore it is more reasonable to think that it did not exist in the Latin version when first made, but was afterwards admitted into it, and got admittance into the Cod. Bezae, in the manner I conjectured in the notes to that part of the collation.

Dr. Middleton confined his extracts to the first 12 chapters of St. Matthew;⁴ the most unprolific chapters of the most unprolific book; for the Cod. Bezae has, in the Gospel of St. Matthew, fewer readings in proportion, than in any other of the books which it contains: and even in the short portion which he collated, there is a chasm of nearly three chapters. Had he selected the other part of the Evangelist, namely, that which I have here examined, he would have made the strength of his cause much more apparent. To a reader, however, who is disposed to examine more minutely

¹ *Introit. Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 235.*

² *Notes to Michaelis, Vol. II. Pt. II. p. 662.*

³ *Ut supra.*

the readings of this MS., I would recommend the Acts of the Apostles, where he will find abundant materials for his consideration.

What has been said does not much affect the other MSS., which have been generally accused of Lengthening; because the passages of that nature in them are but few; nor do they so abound with interpolations. In these respects the Cod. Bezae differs from all other MSS.; nor is it easy, if the Cod. Bezae be absolved from the charge, and its readings be esteemed valuable, to defend the others. In proportion as we extol the Cambridge MS. we diminish the authority of the multitude which dissent from it.

August 18, 1815.

MEMOIR
ON THE
RUINS OF BABYLON;

*By CLAUDIO JAMES RICH, Esq. Resident for the
Honorable East India Company at the Court of the
Pasha of Bagdad. With three plates. 8vo. London,
1815. Longman and Co.*

To the ingenious author of this work we acknowledge ourselves considerably indebted for information on a subject, which, although interesting in the highest degree, seems, amidst the various pursuits of antiquarian travellers, to have been most unaccountably neglected. Perhaps the dangers attending any researches among ruins in the East have induced unprotected visitors to leave the Babylonian remains in full possession of barbarian tribes; but Mr. Rich's official character, as the East India Company's Resident at Bagdad, enabled him during the month of May, 1812, to explore with ease and safety those monuments of remote ages, in company with Mr. Lockett, to whom (p. 3.) he expresses his obligations for the measurements on which was constructed a map or sketch of the Babylonian territory, illustrating this memoir.¹ "From the accounts of modern travellers," says Mr. Rich, "I had expected to have found on the site of Babylon

¹ Captain Lockett's elaborate work on Arabic Grammar, in a quarto volume, issued from the Calcutta press during last year: and this gentleman is now, we understand, in England, preparing for publication the account of his travels and Babylonian Researches, which was announced in a former number of this Journal. See vol. viii. No. xv. p. 52

more, and less, than I actually did : less, because I could have formed no conception of the prodigious extent of the ~~whole~~ ruins, or of the size, solidity, and perfect state of some of the parts of them : and more, because I thought that I should have distinguished some traces, however imperfect, of many of the principal structures of Babylon. I imagined I should have said, 'Here were the walls ; and such must have been the extent of the area. There stood the palace ; and this most assuredly was the tower of Belus.' I was completely deceived : instead of a few insulated mounds, I found the whole face of the country covered with vestiges of buildings ; in some places consisting of brick walls, surprisingly fresh—in others merely of a vast succession of mounds of rubbish of such indeterminate figures, variety, and ~~strangeness~~, as to involve the person who should have formed any theory in inscrutable confusion.'—(p. 2.) Mr. Rich considers the site of Babylon (p. 4.) as sufficiently established in the environs of Hellah, according to Major Rennell's excellent "Geography of Herodotus," a work which he notices with due praise.

The general direction of the road between Baghdad and Hellah, (a meanly-built town, containing six or seven thousand inhabitants) is North and South ; the distance about forty-eight miles—and the whole intermediate country (with the exception of some few spots) a perfectly flat and uncultivated waste.—(pp. 4-8.) But the traces of former population are still numerous :—the plain is intersected by various canals, now neglected ; and exhibits many piles of earth containing fragments of brick and tiles. Through this plain once ran the famous *Naher Malcha*, or *flavus regius*, a work attributed to Nebuchadnezzar ; it is now dry, like other streams that once flowed here, and served for the purposes of irrigation. Not far from the *Naher Malcha* is a ruined bridge over a small canal :—“Some time ago,” says Mr. R., “a large lion came regularly every evening from the banks of the Euphrates, and took his stand on this bridge, to the terror of the traveller ; he was at last shot by a Zobeide Arab.”—(p. 5.) The ruins of Babylon may be said to commence at Mohawil ; about nine miles from Hellah ; the interjacent space exhibiting vestiges of Buildings, burnt and unburnt bricks, and bitumen ; also three mounds, of which the magnitude attracts particular attention. Mr. R. found the Euphrates to be four hundred and fifty feet in breadth at the bridge of Hellah, and in depth two fathoms and a half. When it rises to its full height the adjoining country is inundated, and many parts of the Babylonian ruins are rendered inaccessible.—(p. 13.) The woods and coppices, mentioned by some travellers, no longer appear ; and our author, not having seen the French work of M. Otter, is inclined to believe, “that the word *coppice* must exist only in the translation, as it is an improper term, the only wood being the date gardens of Hellah, to which certainly the word *coppice* will not apply.”—(p. 16.) We find, however, on referring to the original, (*Voyage en Turquie, &c.* tome ii. p. 211.) that M. Otter’s expression sufficiently authorizes this translation : his words are, “La *Geographie Turc* place Babylus après de Hilla, à la gauche du cours de l’Euphrate en allant de la Syrie à Bagdad—aujourd’hui on n’y

voit qu'au bois faillir." Mr. Rich assures us, that, among the ruins of Babylon, there remains but one tree; that, however, is of venerable antiquity, and was once of considerable size. "It is an ever-green, something resembling the *lignum vitae*, and of a kind, I believe, not common in this part of the country, though I am told there is a tree of the same description at Bassora."—(p. 27.)

Without the engraved plan or map it would be almost useless, in this brief notice, to mention the particular directions or dimensions of all the canals, the mounds or masses of ruined buildings, the embankments skirting the river on its eastern side, the boundary line, and others again dividing the whole area, of which our author traces the extent. "The ruins," he observes in p. 20., "consist of mounds of earth, formed by the decomposition of building, channeled and furrowed by the water, and the surface of them strewed with pieces of brick, bitumen, and pottery." Not far from the place called *Jezzama*, is the first great mass of ruins; in length eleven hundred yards, and in greatest breadth eight hundred; its height above the general level of the plain being fifty or sixty feet.—(p. 21.) Another heap of ruins (p. 22.) is nearly seven hundred yards in length and breadth, and appears to have been composed of buildings far superior to all the rest, which have left traces in the eastern quarter. Both these heaps are magazines of bricks, whence the neighbouring inhabitants derive inexhaustible supplies. In excavations made for the purpose of extracting bricks, ancient walls have been discovered, with fragments of alabaster vases, fine pottery, marble, and glazed tiles. Mr. R. found a sepulchral vase of earthen ware, and some human bones; (p. 23.) and not far from this, the figure which M. Beauchamp (as quoted by Major Rennell) had imperfectly seen, and understood from the Arabs to be an idol. "It was a lion of colossal dimensions, standing on a pedestal, of a coarse kind of grey granite, and of rude workmanship; in the mouth was a circular aperture, into which a man might introduce his fist." (p. 25.) The next remarkable object is the *Kasr*, or palace; its walls are formed of such well burnt brick, laid in lime cement so tenacious, that the workmen employed to extract bricks have ceased their labor on account of the extreme difficulty. (p. 28.) The embankment on the river's side is abrupt and perpendicular; at the foot of it are found urns filled with human bones.—(p. 28.) One mile north of the Kasr (and five miles distant from Hellah) is the ruin which Pietro della Valle supposed to have been the Tower of Belus; an opinion adopted by Major Rennell. This the Arabs call *Mata libde*, (ماطليبة) or, according to the vulgar pronunciation, *Mujellibé*; a name which signifies overturned. (p. 28.) Its elevation at the highest angle is one hundred and forty-one feet, and its longest side extends two hundred yards. Those who dig into this heap find whole bricks with inscriptions, and innumerable fragments of pottery, "bitumen, pebbles, vitrified brick or scoria, and even shells, bits of glass, and mother of pearl; on asking a Turk how he imagined these latter substances were brought there, he replied, without the least hesitation, 'By the deluge.'"—(p. 29.) Here also are the dens of wild beasts; and here,

In a curious coincidence, Mr. Rich first heard the oriental account of Satyrs;—for in this desert it is said that the Arabs find an animal resembling a man from the head to the waist, but having the thighs and legs of a sheep or goat, and that they hunt this creature with dogs, and eat the lower part abstaining from the upper, in which consists the resemblance to the human species. Mr. Rich here appositely quotes from Isaiah (ch. xiii. v. 21.) the prophetic passage—" But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and owls shall dwell there, and Satyrs shall dance there."—(p. 30.) He offers also (in the same page) some remarks on the Hebrew word סְתִירָה, here translated *Satyrs*. The limits of this notice will not allow us to communicate, at present, some thoughts suggested by this word. In a future number of the Classical Journal we shall, perhaps, recall the attention of our readers to Mr. Rich's observations: and proceed meanwhile to his account of his entertaining discovery. Having heard that some mummy and a coffin of mulberry wood, with a human body, had been discovered in the Muzelîbè, Mr. R. employed twelve men to dig there, and found a shaft or hollow pier, sixty feet square, in which were a brass spike, some earthen vessels, and a beam of date tree wood; they found in another part burnt bricks with inscriptions, and a wooden coffin, containing a well-preserved skeleton. "Under the head of the coffin was a round pebble; attached to the coffin, on the outside, a brass bird, and inside an ornament of the same material." Near the coffin lay the skeleton of a child.—(p. 33.)

Such are the principal ruins on the eastern side. The western affords only two small mounds of earth, at a place called *Anana*.—(p. 34.) But six miles south-west of Hellah, stands the most stupendous remnant of ancient Babylon; entitled by the Arabs, *Birs Nemroud*, and by the Jews, *Nebuchadnezzar's Prison*. Mr. Rich has so well described his first view of this interesting ruin, that we shall gratify our readers by quoting his own words. "I visited the *Birs* under circumstances peculiarly favorable to the grandeur of its effect. The morning was at first hazy and threatened a severe fall of rain; but we approached the object of our journey, the heavy clouds separating, discovered the *Birs* frowning over the plain, and presenting the appearance of a circular hill, crowned by a tower, with a high ridge extending along the foot of it. Its being entirely concealed from our view during the first part of our ride, prevented our acquiring the gradual idea, in general so prejudicial to effect, and so particularly lamented by those who visit the Pyramids. Just as we were within the proper distance, it burst at once upon our sight, in the midst of rolling masses of thick black clouds, partially obscured by that kind of haze whose indistinctness is one great cause of sublimity; whilst a few strong catches of stormy light, thrown upon the desert in the background, served to give some idea of the immense extent and dreary solitude of the wastes, in which this venerable ruin stands."—(p. 56.)

The *Birs* of Nemroud is an oblong mound, in circumference seven

hundred and sixty-two yards, and it rises on the western side to an elevation of one hundred and ninety-eight feet. On the summit is a solid pile, thirty-seven feet high, of fine burnt bricks, exhibiting inscriptions. Other immense fragments of brick work are found also in this mound, which is itself a ruin, standing within a quadrangular inclosure. Near the Birs is another mound, and vestiges of ruins may be traced to a considerable extent.

In the vicinity of Hellah are several remains, which bear some relation to the ruins of Babylon. —(p. 39.) A tomb attributed to the prophet Job—the large camp of Jaseria—two large masses called Al-mokhatat and El-mouar—and others near the village of Jerbo. “The governor of Hellah,” says Mr. R., “informed me of a mound as large as the Mujelibé, situated thirty-five hours to the southward of Hellah; and that a few years ago, a cap or diadem of pure gold, and some other articles of the same metal, were found there, which the Khezail Arabs refused to give up to the Pasha.”—(p. 39.) There are other mounds of considerable antiquity in various directions; among them, six miles east of Hellah, a ruin which resembles on a smaller scale the Birs Nemroud; it is called al-Hleimar.—(p. 40.) A mass, which the Arabs denominate akir ~~the tower~~, and ascribe, like most of the remains in this country, to Nimrod, appears also of Babylonian origin. It stands ten miles N. W. of Bagdad, and rises to the height of one hundred and twenty-six feet.—(p. 41.)

Having offered some cursory remarks on the accounts left us by the ancients, our author declares his opinion, that, whatever may have been the size of Babylon, “its population bore no proportion to it; and that it would convey to a mind the idea of an inclosed district rather than that of a regular city.”—(p. 43.) The tower, (temple, pyramid, or sepulchre,) of Belus, corresponds, he thinks, in measurement “as nearly as possible, considering our ignorance of the exact proportion of the stadium,” with the ruin called Mujelibé.—(p. 49.) “The only building,” adds he, “which can dispute the palm with the Muje-libé, is the Birs Nemroud; previous to visiting which, I had not the slightest idea of the possibility of its being the tower of Belus; indeed its situation was a strong argument against such a supposition: but the moment I had examined it, I could not help exclaiming, ‘Had this been on the other side of the river, and nearer the great mass of ruins, no one could doubt of its being the remains of the tower.’”—(p. 52.) After an examination of the arguments against and for this opinion, Mr. R. leaves to learned men the decision of this point. He believes that the number of buildings in Babylon bore no proportion to the great space inclosed by the wall; that the houses were small, and mostly consisted of merely a ground floor, or *basse cour*; that the public edifices were more vast than beautiful, and that the tower of Belus was astonishing only from its size. “All the sculptures which are found among the ruins, though some of them are executed with the greatest apparent care, speak a barbarous people.”—(p. 58.) And it would appear that the Babylonians were unacquainted with the arch, notwithstanding M. Dutens’ assertion to the contrary. “The ruins of

Babylon furnishes bricks of two sorts: some burnt in a kiln, others simply dried in the sun; and the cement used appears to be bitumen, mortar and clay, or mud. "At the Majilibé, layers of reeds are found on the top of every layer of mud-cement, between it and the layer of brick."—(p. 65.)

Thus have we epitomized, however inadequately, this interesting memoir, which was originally published at Vienna, in the "Mémoires de l'Orient;" a work conducted by the learned orientalist, Mr. Hammer. "In it I have given," says Mr. Rich, "a faithful account of my observations at Babylon, and offer it merely as a prelude to further researches, which repeated visits to the same spot may enable me to make."—(p. 66.)

The present volume does not exceed beyond sixty-seven octavo pages; and serves rather to excite than to satisfy curiosity. Besides the plan above mentioned, it is illustrated with two plates containing sketches of the Birs Nemrûd, the Kasr, the Majilibé, and the embankment on the river Euphrates; which, though very small, seem to be accurate, and as no other authentic delineations of the Babylonian remains have ever been engraved, (at least to our knowledge,) these must be considered as valuable, until larger, handsomer, or better, shall have appeared.

After the perusal of this little memoir, we look forward with impatience for more ample information. Such may reasonably be expected from the result of Mr. Rich's future researches among the ruins, & from Captain Lockett's work with the views and plans announced two years ago in the Classical Journal, and at present, as we believe, nearly ready for publication. Meanwhile we would direct the notice of our readers to many passages scattered through the pages of Mr. Rich's memoir, especially the critical and etymological remarks of this ingenious writer on the Hebrew word שְׁטָבָע (to which we before alluded,) signifying, as differently translated, "satyrs, hairy-ones, devils, evil spirits, &c." (p. 30.) on קַרְנֵבָעַ, or, Chaldaic, בְּנֵשׁ רִבָּע, perhaps the modern *Bourra* بُرْرَاء, and "probably," says Mr. R. "the Borsippa of Strabo and Borsita of Ptolemy."—(p. 39.) On the expression of Herodotus στρατίου καὶ τὸ μῆκος καὶ τὸ εὖρος.—(p. 43.) On Genesis xi. 4. בְּנֵשׁ רִבָּע. Also on Genesis xi. 9. relative to the bricks and mortar or cement used in the construction of Babel. (p. 60.) Concerning all these passages we shall venture to offer our own opinions in another place, and close this article by suggesting, on the authority of a friend (who has travelled in the east) that *Birs* بُرْرَاء applied to the mound or tower of Nissæd, and apparently not Arabic, (as Mr. R. observes p. 34.) may possibly be a corruption from some other word, like *Makallibé*, vulgarly pronounced *Majilibé* (p. 28.) where we find both letters and accents altered: thus our friend thinks, it not improbable that the *BRS* which form the word *Birs* بُرْرَاء are nothing more than the *BRJ* of بُرْرَاء *Birr* or *Burj*, signifying "a tower," the *BR* comprising the radicals of بُرْرَاء, according to the change usually made by Arabs, who, not having in their alphabet either *p* or *g*,

(like ours in gold, or the Greek gamma,) substitute for these letters their ψ B, and γ γ. Castell is inclined to derive the Arabic بَرْسَ from πύργος,¹ and we shall here remark, as a coincidence favourable to the conjecture above-mentioned, that Herodotus, in his first book, applies πύργος to the tower of Belus, and that from Mr. Rich's description (p. 51, 52, &c.) there are strong reasons for supposing that ornament of ancient Babylon to be the veryquin now denominated the *Birs* of Ninrod.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

HEBREW DESCENT OF THE ABYSSINIANS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE CLASSICAL JOURNAL.

IN reading the xxxvth chapter of Jeremiah, and meeting with the name Habaziniah as the chief of the house of the Rechabites, and reflecting on the commands given by Jonadab their father to his sons (which they had faithfully observed), and comparing them with the name, language, and customs of the Abyssinians, as mentioned by Ludolf, Bruce, and others; and more particularly from observing the evident analogy between the name of this son of Jonadab, and that of the country of Abyssinia; I was strongly impressed with the idea, that the Abyssinians might be originally of this family, and that the house of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, who was never to want a man to stand before the Lord, might probably be found in Abyssinia at this day. I now trouble you with a few thoughts on this subject, and shall feel obliged by the opinion of any of your learned correspondents, and further information concerning it.

In 1 Chr. vi. 55. we are informed that Hamath was the father of the Kenites, and of the house of Rechab; and these Kenites are here reckoned among the families of Judah: and in 2 Kings, x. 15. Jonadab the son of Rechab is mentioned; being in the Hebrew in this place, בְּנֵי Jehonadab, though it is sometimes found in Jeremiah with and without the בְּנֵי, and this Jehonadab is, in this xth chapter, found living in the days of Jehu, King of Israel.

In the xxxvth ch. of Jeremiah, or in the days of Jehoakim, son of Josiah, King of Judah, and of Jeremiah the Prophet, we read of

εγέρται δὲ οὐ καὶ Γρ. πύργος, λιργός, αρχιτερίς, προπραγμάτης, ἀτ. Lexicon, Hepenglott. in voce. p. 427.

house as then existing ; and mention is made of the heads of three generations from him, namely of Jaazaniah, the son of Jeremiah, the son of Habaziniah ; and of the sons of the third, viz. of Jaaziniah, making the fourth generation, ver. 1, 2 ; and of these three chiefs of the house of their fathers, Habaziniah seems to be the first in descent from Jonadab, and to be the person to whom the commandments were given. He was therefore the head of the house of Jonadab, and having obeyed the commands of his father, he transmitted them to his posterity to be kept in like manner : and as these commands (which were accompanied with a proposed advantage from the observance of them) were first given by Jonadab to his son Habaziniah, the latter became the beginning or head of all following generations, who should continue to obey their father Jonadab. Is it not probable that his name might be retained by his posterity as the patronymic name of the house of Rechab ? Can they be found, at this day, under this name, in any nation, tribe, or people ? Is not the country of Abyssinia named from this house ? May I be permitted to state a few circumstances, which may probably assist in this inquiry ; and first, concerning the name of this people and country ?

Jobus Ludolfus, in his Hist. *Aethiopica*, lib. i. ch. i. "De variis Habessinorum nominibus, et gentis origine," inquires fully into this matter. He says they are generally called Habessini, or Abissini, or Abasseni ; from the Arabian word *Habesh* ; which signifies a colluvies or mixture of nations, or a number of men of different tribes or nations ; and he thinks (note h.) that the Habessini may therefore be called *convenas* : both signifying, according to Bruce, a number of distinct people meeting accidentally in one place, 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 323. Ludolf further informs us, that they long despised this appellation, as being opprobrious to them ; and that they did not even acknowledge it in their books in his time, choosing rather that their kingdom should be called the kingdom of *Aethiopia*, and themselves *Aethiopians* ; a word received from the Greeks, but too general, and common to all men of an adust color, and formerly even in Asia : that, if you ask for a particular name, they call their kingdom *Geez*, also the region *Ag-azi*, or the land of *Ag-azjan*, that is, of free men, *liberorum* ; which he thus explains, "a libertate, sive a transitu, et profectio-
tione, quia verbum radicale *Geeza* utramque significacionem admittit :" and he thinks, that probably from passing in the most ancient times from Arabia into Africa, to seek other settlements, they took this name as a sign of liberty, as the Germans having passed the Rhine took that of Franks : and he thinks that the

^{1.} Quam appellationem tanquam sibi proprosata diu s'p'reverunt, nec adhuc in Tigris sua agnoscunt.

Abyasinians dwelt formerly in Arabia, and were reckoned with the Sabæans, or Homœites, &c. His words are; “*Indigenæ enim non sunt; sed venerunt ex ea Arabiae parte, quæ Felix vocatur, et mari rubro adjacet; unde facile in Africam transfretare potuerunt.* Abassenos enim in Arabia olim habuit se, atque Sabæis, sive (quod idem est) Homeritis accensitos fuisse, et veteres geographi testantur, et multa alia convincunt argumenta. Nam lingua illorum vetus, quam *Æthiopicam* vocamus, Arabicæ maxime affinis est: mores nonnullos, veluti circumcisionem, cum Arabibus communem habent: ingenium et forma corporis, atque vultus, ad Arabes magis quam ad *Æthiopas Africanos* accedit: quin et Severus Imperator inter gentes Arabiae devictas ~~nummis~~ suis etiam Abassenos (*note o,* ‘*Ἄβασηνῶν, Scalig.*’) inscribi curavit.” And he concludes this first chapter thus; “*Romæ* ~~scm~~ primum libri *Æthiopici* typis ederentur, lingua eorum Chaldaea, illi vero erronee modo *Chaldei*, modo Indi dicti fuerunt. *Nos Habessiniæ vel Abassiaæ* nomen, jam universo orbi notum, *interdum* et *Æthiopiaæ* retinebimus,” &c.

In his Commentary, lib. *i.c.* i. No. 14. Ludolf enlarges upon the etymology of the names Habessini and Habesh, thus; “*Ha-*
bessini: nomen hoc in toto oriente, et nunc quoque in Europa *Æthiopes* nostri obtinent; variaute parumper pronunciatione. Alii enim *Abasseni*, *Abassini*, vel *Abissini*, *Abessini*, vel *Ebeschi*,” (justly observing) “multi male *Abyssini* scribunt, quia hæc ~~ver~~ cum Abysso nihil ~~habet~~ commune. Nos Abessinorum appellationem prætulimus, pronunciationem Orientalium imprimis Arabum secuti.” “Etenim in historia nostra docuimus, originem hujus appellationis Arabicam esse, radicis *Habescha*, vel *Habastha*,” &c. “et hinc *Habesch* vel *Habeschi*, *Habessinus*,” &c. &c. vide. And in No. 15. he thinks that it well agrees with the history of the transmigration of the Abyssinians from Arabia Felix into Africa; “Quippe migrationes gentium plerumque ~~fuerint~~ cum confusione generis egenorum hominum,” &c. adding, “Id *Habessiniis* contigisse credibile est, hominum multitudine patriam gravante; Sabæi enim, ex quibus originem trahunt, numerosissimi erant: and he thinks it probable, that, though the name might be adopted at the time of the emigration, it might also be given to those who remained, “Nisi fortassis gentes e variis tribubus mixtae hoc nomen antea in Arabia Felice gesserint, ad quorum exemplum novis colonis nomen istud impositum fuit; id enim apud veteres in *Arabia* reperitur;” showing, by a quotation from Stephanus; that a nation of this name formerly lived in Arabia; “*Stephanus de urbibus: Αβασηνοὶ πόλες Ἀγαβίαι, Abaseni populus Arabiae: addit ex Uraniō μετὰ τοὺς Σαβαῖους Χαδραμώται καὶ Αβασηνοὶ, post Sabaeos Chadroneitæ et Abaseni, καὶ πάλιν, ἡ χώρα τῶν Αβασηνῶν, Regio Abassenorum.*” Here I may remark that the Greek name ‘*Αβασηνοὶ*’ would be as near to the rendering of the Hebrew word,

חֲבָשִׁים *Hhabassim*, or short *Habassim*, meaning the children or descendants of **חָבָשׁ**, *חַבָּשִׁיָּה*, as might be expected according to the Greek manner of rendering Hebrew proper names ; as in the Septuagint, &c.

Ludolf, being about to speak of the conversion of the Abyssinians, by Frumentius, their first Bishop, lib. iii. c. 2. and having shown the improbability of its having happened before, observes ; “ Id demum certum est, quod et Habessinorum, et Græcorum Latinorumque scriptores, cum primis Ruffinus et qui eum sequuntur, consensu tradunt, tempore S. Athanasii, Patriarchæ Alexandrini, sub Constantino Magno, circa annum Christi 330, (ut quidem Tellezius computat) vel non ita multo post, conversionem Aethiopiarum hoc pacto contigisse ; ” &c. &c. proceeding to show the manner in which it was produced. See Scaliger de Emend. Temp. p. 681, where he seems erroneously to conclude that the Abyssinian nation had not passed from Arabia into Aethiopia in the beginning of the 6th century ; which error seems fully pointed out by Ludolf, in his Com. lib. i. c. 1. and clearly refuted by the quotation just given.

Joseph Scaliger (ib. p. 680), speaking of the Abyssinians, observes : “ Isti agitur Aethiopes, de quibus sermo est, Arabice dicuntur Elhabaschi. Unde vulgo Habassi, et Habasseni vocantur. Quod est argumentum eos non esse Aethiopias abrochboras, sed ex Arabia illuc traductos. Nam Aethiopias collocantur in Arabia turingera a vetere scriptore Uranio apud Stephanum. In Severi autem Imperatoris numismate sculptum est Αβασηνῶν. Atqui Severus Imperator dictus est Arabicus, non autem Aethiopicus. Quare sine dubio ex Arabia oriundi sunt, et prius Omenigritai dicebantur, quamdiu in Arabia fuerunt. Postea Axumitæ, a regia, sive metropoli urbe. Non igitur mirum, si qui apud Plinium et Ptolæum vocantur Omenigritai in Arabia Felici, ii Procopio Axumitæ cognominantur. Axuma enim sunt in Aethiopiam, non in Arabia Felici. Huc accedit lingua, qua sacros libros scriptos habent, quæ a vera Aethiopica tantum discrepat, quantum Italica et Illyrica ; Germanica et Hungarica. Hæc autem lingua, qua in sacris utuntur, elegantissima est si modo cultura adhibeatur. Vocatur autem ὕψη, id est libertas, quod nimis ea sola uterentur Arabes illi victores, qui Aethiopiam insiderunt. Hoc scio, non concedent Aethiopes ipsi, qui regum suorum seriem hactenus a diluvio usque in Chronicis suis ordine descriptam habent. Sed quia illa Chronologia nobis tenebrarum plena visa est, non sine dilectu illi fidem adhibemus censemus. Nobis constat hanc linguam adventitiam esse. Testes enim ipsos Aethiopias advoco, qui eam Chaldaicam vocant. Tametsi enim proprius ab Hebreis, quam a Chaldeis : tamen hoc arguento ipsius fidem faciunt non esse ibi

natam, ubi nunc colitur, et ex solis libris a solis sacerdotibus dicta-
citur."

Mr. Bruce says, "The people assert themselves at this day to be *agaazi*, that is, a race of shepherds inhabiting the mountains of the Habab;" that they were *Sabaeans*; that these shepherds were in most respects different from the negro woolly-headed *Cushite*, "as they had long hair, European features, very dusky and dark complexions, but nothing like the blackmoor or negro; that they lived in plains, had moveable huts or habitations, while attending their numerous cattle, and wandered from the necessities and particular circumstances of their country: that they were generally called shepherds, are still existing living by the same occupation, never had another and therefore cannot be mistaken: that "the mountains which the *Agtazi* inhabit are called Habab, from which it comes that they themselves have got that name;" that "the noblest and most warlike of all the shepherds were those that inhabited the mountains of the Habab, and that they still dwelt there: that Habab, in their language and in the Arabic, signifies a serpent; and his editor, in a note, observes, that, according to the book of Axum, Arwe is the first king of Axum, and reigned 400 years; that before their conversion to Christianity, the *Ethiopian* historians say that their nation worshipped Arwe, the serpent, and part were Jews, people of the law, &c. *Bruce's Travels*, vol. ii.

Bruce also reports that "in Abyssinia, besides the *Cushites* and the shepherds, there are various nations which agree with this description, who have each a particular name, and who are all known by that of *Habesh*, in Latin, *Convenæ*, signifying," as above mentioned, "a number of distinct people meeting accidentally in one place;" and thinks that the word has been misunderstood and misapplied by Scaliger, Ludolf, and others. He speaks of Abyssinia having been inhabited, according to the *Chronicle of Axum*, about 1808 years before Christ, &c.; that about the 1400th year before Christ, it was taken possession of by a variety of people speaking different languages, who sat down in a friendly manner beside the *Agaazi*, or shepherds, then possessing the high country of *Tigré*, which finished the peopling of Abyssinia, and that tradition declared they came from Palestine; from which he conjectures that these new settlers were the nations of Canaan, who had fled from before Joshua; which his editor thinks is neither probable nor authentic. *Ib. vol. ii. p. 322, 323, 324.*

Respecting the conversion of the Abyssinians to Christianity, Bruce (*ib. p. 431.*) thinks it happened about the time mentioned by Ludolf, and by means of Frumentius. He observes, "We know certainly, that the first Bishop, ordained for the conversion of Abyssinia, was sent from Alexandria by St. Athanasius, who was

Himself ordained to that see about the year 326. Therefore any account prior to this ordination and conversion must be false ; and this conversion and ordination must therefore have happened about the year 330, or possibly some few years later," &c. ; referring to *Ludolf*, vol. ii. lib. iii. cap. 2. viz. *Hist. Æthiop.*

From considering Bruce's account of the above Chronicle, and of *Arwe*, and comparing it with the Editor's note, may we not conjecture, that, by the worshipping of the Serpent (meaning the Old Serpent), for the period of four hundred years, and that he was their first king, being called *Arwe*, (which, by a very natural etymology from the Hebrew, might signify *the King*, חָרְבָּה, *har-rohe*, or *roe*, or *the shepherd*), a parabolic history of the nation, from the time of its emigration from Arabia to its conversion to Christianity, is given ? Or, that the nation, emigrating about seventy years before the birth of our Lord, did, as it were, continue in certain errors, under the dominion of the Old Serpent, until A. D. 330, and were then converted to Christianity, making a period of four hundred years ? And as, in order to avoid the opprobrious name, they called themselves by the name of the original inhabitants of *Aethiopia*, or *Aethiopians* ; may not their claims to a more remote antiquity of residence, as found in the same Chronicle, be thus accounted for ? This application of *Arwe* to the Old Serpent seems fully warranted by the following extract from *Ludolf* ; in which the Poet, celebrating the praises of nine pious monks, who zealously endeavoured to promote the knowledge of that Gospel which *Frumentius* had introduced, most evidently refers to the kingdom of Satan, as is explained by *Ludolf* ;

“ *Salutem Sanctis ! qui concorditer viserunt concordiam :*
“ *Ut per preces destruerent regnum Arwe (Serpentis).*”

Per vocem *Arwe*, quæ *Serpentem* significat, vel regnum *Satanae* in genere intelligit, quod propagatione Christianismi fuit destrutum ; vel Etlenicisnum *Aethiopicum* in specie.” *Lud. Hist. lib. ii. c. 3.*

I shall now make a few cursory remarks on the opinions of Scaliger, Ludolf, and Bruce, as hints for further inquiry. I have above shown that Scaliger considers the name of this people, *Hasbaschi*, vulgo *Abassi*, et *Abasseni*, as derived from the Arabic, and that they undoubtedly came from Arabia, and were called, in Arabia, Ḥabashah ; and afterwards (when in Africa) Axumitæ : and that he thinks their language, in which their sacred books are written, which is called יִבְרֵא, is a dialect of the true *Aethiopic*, but the most elegant ; and that it is an adventitious language, as allowed by themselves who call it Chaldee, although it is nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldee ; and that Ludolf also derives

the name *Habessini*, &c. from the same Arabian source, from the word *Habesh*, &c.; but whether it might be adopted at the time of the emigration, as expressive of the conflux of different kinds of people which generally happens on these occasions, and might be believed to happen to the Abyssinians, and was then applied to those about to emigrate and to those who were left behind; or whether there might have before existed nations in Arabia Felix consisting of various tribes called by this name, which after their example was given to the new colonists, he leaves undetermined. Therefore this etymology and explanation of Ludolf are unsatisfactory, and seem to be wholly conjectural. But it appears by his quotation from Stephanus, which includes that of Uranius, that the Abyssinian people did certainly exist in Arabia at a very early period, under the name of *Ἄβασηνοι*, and that the region which they there inhabited was called *ἡ γύρω τῶν Ἀβασηνῶν*, the region of the Abyssinians. And although they, afterwards, had the general name of *Ὥρησίται*, because they then dwelt, and were numbered, among that people, it is manifest from the coin of Severus, that they had also the distinct name of *Ἄβασηνοι*, or Abyssinians.

Had the name *Habeschi*, or *Habesh*, been their original name, they would most probably have been called by the Greeks *Ἄβασοι*, instead of *Ἄβασηνοι*. Is it not more probable that the Arabic name *Habeschi* was a kind of nick-name given to them by the Arabians, perhaps from considering them as a different people, and probably made up of different tribes, particularly as the Abyssinians considered it as opprobrious? This might very naturally be the case; as, supposing them to be the sons of Habatsiniah, the son of Jonadab, they were a different people, whose customs might in various respects differ from those of the Arabians, who might therefore give them the name of *Habesh*, by way of contempt; which might readily occur to them from the similarity of their patronymic name. And this similarity, and the contemptuous meaning being generally understood, might even determine the Abyssinians to lay aside their original name, and adopt that of the country where they dwelt. If so, it is the more probable that this people, who had probably sojourned some considerable time in Arabia, were really a nation different from the Arabian.

Ludolf further informs us, as already noticed, that they call their kingdom Geez, also the region Ag-azi, or land Ag-azjan; which he renders of freemen, *liberorum*, and considers it as having been adopted by them as a sign of liberty at some time of their passage from Arabia into Africa.

Mr. Bruce, who shows that they are a very different people from the *Ethiopians*, says that they call themselves *Agaazi*, or race of shepherds, as he interprets it, who inhabit the mountains of *Nabob*; that, in Abyssinia there are various other nations, who

with them are generally known by the name of Habesh, or *convene*, which he explains as above.

But these and all the other etymologies proceed from the consideration of the Abyssinians being Arabians, and their language the Arabic. But from the idea of their being the sons of Habaziniah of the house of Rechab, and their language the Hebrew, and that their original name was a patronymic name from their father Habaziniah, we are naturally led to the Hebrew in tracing the etymology of their name, and that of their language and country. Considering the subject in this light, I proceed with my remarks, and shall begin with the account given by the Prophet Jeremiah of this family or nation.

In the 35th chapter of Jeremiah it is reported, that in the days of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, King of Judah, Jeremiah was commissioned to go to the house of the Rechabites, and to bring them into a chamber of the house of the Lord, and to give them wine to drink. The Prophet having offered them pots full of wine, they answered, "We will drink no wine, for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us saying, 'Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye, nor your sons for ever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents, that ye may live many days in the land, where ye be strangers.' Thus have we obeyed the voice of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, in all that he hath charged us, to drink no wine all our days, we, our wives, our sons, nor our daughters; nor to build houses for us to dwell in; neither have we field, nor vineyard, nor seed; but we have dwelt in tents, and have obeyed and done according to all that Jonadab our father commanded us. But it came to pass when Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, came up into the land, that we said, 'Come, let us go to Jerusalem for fear of the army of the Chaldeans, and for fear of the army of the Syrians:' so we dwell at Jerusalem."

How good and how pleasant is this account of filial veneration, affection, and obedience! The children of Jonadab, even to the fourth generation, are found walking in the commandments of their father.

God, wishing to instruct the Jews, having contrasted the obedience of the sons of Jonadab with their disobedience, is pleased to bestow a gracious promise upon the house of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, as the reward of their obedience; while punishment is denounced against Judah and Jerusalem, for their contempt of the divine commands. The promise runs thus, "Because ye have obeyed the commandment of Jonadab your father, and kept all his precepts, and done according to all that he hath commanded you; therefore thus saith the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel: Jonadab,

the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me for ever :" 18th and 19th verses.

Are we not warranted, in faith of this promise, to look for the family of Jonadab at this day ? Do they not now live in Abyssinia ? Is not this worthy of inquiry ?

In proceeding with the few hints I now offer, I shall first notice the text of Jeremiah, and then endeavour to show, that the words, according to the same easy and natural etymology before mentioned, are more referable to a Hebrew, than to an Arabic origin ; and lastly, attempt to point out, that above an eighth part of a vocabulary of Abyssinian words, given by Bruce, are chiefly Hebrew words : thus paving the way for further inquiry.

Jer. xxxv. 3. "Then I took Jaazaniah, the son of Jeremiah, the son of Habaziniah, and his brethren, and all his sons, and the whole house of the Rechabites ;"—

Here are four generations from Jonadab, who was alive, and probably a young man, in the reign of Jehu, a period of about two hundred and seventy eight years. So that the generations of Jonadab and his sons, being to the fifth generation inclusive, amounted to above two hundred and seventy years ; making, according to this number, 54 years to each generation ; which, though more than usually reckoned to a generation, would only confirm the prophetic intimation given by the father, when he commanded his sons to abstain from wine.

The part of this verse which requires our particular observation, is the word Habaziniah, the father of all the succeeding children of Jonadab. In Hebrew it is חֲבָצִינְיָה, *Hhabatsinjah*, according to the Masoretic punctuation ; or, without the points, *Hhabatsiniah* : and how very near is this to Abyssinia, or rather to Abassiniah. It is indeed formed by simply leaving out the aspiration of the first Hebrew letter, and reserving the vowel with which it is here naturally connected, and changing the *t* of *tsadi*, the double Hebrew letter, for *s*, and thus instead of *ts*, giving *ss* ; a change which is very common in rendering Hebrew proper names, as the reader will soon perceive. But before I proceed further, I beg leave to call the reader's attention to the very proper remark of Ludolf, in lib. i. ch. i. No. xiv. of his Commentary already quoted ; where he points out the impropriety of the term *Abyssini*, as having nothing in common with that of *Abyss*. If, therefore, the improper pronunciation of *Abyssinians* was omitted, and that of *Abassinians* substituted in its place, it might more agree with the etymology given by Ludolf ; and would fully agree with that from the Hebrew, according to the usual rendering of proper names.

Various readings of this name in its passage through different translations :—Heb. חֲבָצִינְיָה, *Hhabatsiniah* :—Sept. Χαβασινιος,

Chabasinus :—*Vulg.* *Habsania* :—et ita Castellio, Mont. et Pag.
Chabussiniah :—Jun. et Tremel. *Chabatzinja* :—Schmid. *Chabazinja* :—Joan. Cleric. *Chabattzinja* :—Eng. *Habazinah*.

Now you will perceive that, according to the different powers assigned to the double Hebrew letters of the original word, and to the usual mode of rendering proper names, all these various readings may be easily accounted for and explained: and the change in producing the proper name of the Abyssinians, which, according to our derivation from Habazinia, and making it as short and harmonious as possible, seems to be *Abassinians*, is easy and natural.

I shall now endeavour to show that there is so great a resemblance between the language of Abyssinia and the Hebrew, that, notwithstanding the great changes which might be expected to happen, and which have happened, in their manner of speech, from their intercourse with different tribes and nations, during the long period of above two thousand years, the reader will agree with me in opinion, that their language was originally the Hebrew; and, from this and other circumstances he may finally conclude, that they themselves are the sons of Jonadab, and probably the chief part of the family of the house of Rechab.

A portion of the Lord's Prayer in the Ethiopic, or Abyssinian language, compared with that of the Hebrew, Arabic and Syriac, chiefly from Fry's Pantographia; with some remarks.

P. 82. Mr. Fry gives the Lord's Prayer, first in Ethiopic characters, from *Orat. Dom.* p. 14, and calls it the Ethiopic; or Amharic, from Amhara the chief city of Abyssinia: 2dly, p. 83. a literal reading of the same, from *Wilk. Ess.* p. 435.

From this last, I now give the preface and first petition, as a specimen of the reading of the Abyssinian language; and at the same time the readings of the Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac; by which the reader may judge concerning the Abyssinian.

P. 148. This preface and petition are taken from the Hebrew edition of Munster; and read thus, קדש שכמים י' אבינו shebashamajim jikkadesh shemeca.

Heb. reading. Abinu shebashamajim: jikkadesh shemeca.

P. 83. *Eth. or Abyss.* Abuna xabashamajath. Ythkadash shinacha.

P. 282. *Syriac.* Abhoun dbhaschmajo. Nethkadash shmoch. *Orat. Dom.* p. 12.

P. 8. *Arabic.* Ya abanalladi phissamawati. Yatakaddasu smoca. *Wilk. Ess.* p. 435.

In considering these four various readings, it seems evident that the Ethiopic, or Abyssinian, is nearest to the Hebrew; and that the Ethiopic preface is more like the Syriac than the Arabic, to which last it seems to have little resemblance. Is not this a convincing argument that they were not originally Arabians?

In further proof of the similarity of the Abyssinian language to the Hebrew, I shall now give a short extract from Bruce, of a vocabulary of the five languages spoken in Abyssinia when he was there; omitting, in the different columns, those words which seem to have no affinity to the Hebrew; and adding the Hebrew.

<i>English.</i>	<i>Amharic.</i>	<i>Falashan.</i>	<i>Gafat.</i>	<i>Agow.</i>	<i>Teluris.</i>	<i>Hebrew.</i>	<i>Latin.</i>	<i>English.</i>
A star	kokeb	kokeb	כּוֹכֶב	Kokab, stella, sidus,	star.
Fruit	fre	fra	frash	פְּרִי	peri or pkri, fructus,	fruit.
Honey	debsa	דְּבָשׁ	debash, mel, honey.	
Father	abat	yaba	abuya	אֵבָּה	ab, pater, father.	
The head	ras	רָאשׁ	rash or rash, caput,	the head.
Hair	tsegur	tschegur	שְׂגָהָר	seggar, pilus, capil-	lus, hair.
A horse	feres	ferza	ferdesh	firs	feras	פְּרַשׁ	pharash, eques, a	horseman.
Camel	gemele	gembila	gemuli	gemla	gemla	גָּמָל	gamal, camelus, ca-	mel.
Eye	ain	ie	ein	עֵין	ghain, oculus, the	eye.
Mouth	af	אַפְּנָה	aphaph, circuire, to	go round.
Teeth	sena	שְׁנִים	shen, dens, tooth.	
Ear	azin	אָזֶן	ozen or azen, auris,	ear.
Heart	leb	lebeb	lebedje	לְבָבָּה	lebab, spr, and de-	fects.
To kill	mwata	הַמִּתְהָ	hemith, mori facere,	
Die	mota	מוֹתָה	muth, mori, to die.	
Bless	baraka	barket	barkuwa	barku	בָּרוּךְ	barak, benedixit, to	bless.
Near	kerbo	kerhuwi	בָּרוּכָה	beracah, benedictio,	a blessing.
Far	arak	קָרְבָּה	kareb, propinquum,	
A son	ledj	קָרְבָּה	prope, near.	
Awoman	asaset	אֲנָשָׁה	aruk, deferre in lon-	
A bird	af	yafe	עַזְفָּה	guf, volare, to fly.	
To hide	zafna	tsafni	צָפָנָה	tsophan, abscondere,	

I may here remark, that, in the vocabulary from which the above is taken, about one hundred and eighty two words are given; and that, in the above extract, there are about twenty two, being more than an eighth part of the whole, which seem evidently to be derived from the Hebrew; yea, frequently, to be Hebrew itself. If, then, the "similarity of language is the best proof of the common origin of nations, and such a proof as will illustrate, above any other monument, the history of mankind, even admitting that no other relic existed," *Bruce*: I beg leave to offer the above as a strong presumptive proof of the Hebrew descent of the Abyssinians.

Another circumstance may be mentioned, which may assist in this inquiry; it is, that Bochart, in *Hieroz.* vol. i. lib. ii. c. 48, in speaking of the sons of Nebaioth, the son of Ishmael, the Nabatæi, an Arabian nation, observes, that Diodorus speaks of them as having customs like unto those of the Rechabites. "Quod de Nabatæis Diodorus disertè scribit libro decimo nono, p. 722. *Nomo*, &c. 'Lex ipsis est, ut neque fructus serant, neque fructiferam ullam arborem inserant, neque vino utantur, neque domos adfiscant.' Quæ sunt ipsissima Rechabitarum instituta." *Jer. xxxv. 6. 7.* But were they not rather some of the descendants of Jonadab, then sojourning among the children of Nebaioth, the son of Ishmael?

KATON.

ON THE GREEK AND LATIN ACCENTS.

No. III.

THE Hebrew language, like the Greek, was written originally as if the text were but one word, without distinction of words or sentences. Juxta sententiam Cabballistarum tota lex ut instar *unius* versiculi, quin et secundum quosdam *unius* vocis (sive vocabuli). Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum. p. 19. By what means, besides the introduction of the five final letters above mentioned, the Jews contrived to divide words in context one from another, I do not know; but it is generally known, that the division of *sentences* in Hebrew is effected by some of the Hebrew Accents, such as, Silluk, Athnac, Segol, and Zakeph Katon. These answer the purposes of our full stop, colon, semi-colon, and comma. The Hebrews are supposed to have introduced points and accents about the fifth century, and there can be little doubt that they have been copied from the Greek Model. But those who adopt the invention of others, are very apt to flatter themselves, that they can improve on it. Accordingly the

Masoretic school of Tiberias have so overloaded the Hebrew letters with adscititious marks, as to make them an annoyance rather than an assistance to the reader. The text is almost obscured by the quantity of clothing given to it. *Pars minima est ipsa Puella sui.* The greatest enemies however to Punctuation admit the utility of those points, whose office it is to distinguish periods, and their members. It is enough for my purpose to state, that there exists this striking analogy between the Greek and Hebrew accents, that they are both subservient not to pronunciation merely, but to distinction, the Hebrew to the distinction of *sentences*, the Greek to the distinction of *words*.

The consideration of the preceding doctrine relative to the Initial Spirits, and the Final Acute may suffice to let in a full light upon matters, which hitherto have been enveloped in an impenetrable cloud. It would be both tedious and invidious to expose the strained conceits, and unsatisfactory dreams rather than arguments and proofs of modern Grammarians as to the use of the lene spirit, and the grave on Oxytons. I flatter myself, that the principles, which I have unfolded, are capable of affording a clear and general insight into these two peculiarities of Greek Orthography, and that it may now be said confidently,

Repentè

Scindit se nubes, et in æthera purgat apertum.

To remove however all doubt upon the subject, as far as I am able, I will enter into a more detailed examination of the system and pursue the application of it to some other particulars. It may be considered as a part of this system and as a confirmation of the truth of it, that the acute resumes its ordinary character, whenever Oxytons are followed by an Enclitic. An Oxyton so circumstanced is not a *final* quality, but becomes incorporated with the Enclitic, and therefore in such case the position of a final acute would be wrong, and a contradiction and misdirection.

An Oxyton likewise has no occasion for a final acute, and does not positively require it, whenever it concludes a sentence, and I may add, on the strong ground of Analogy, whenever it terminates a colon, or a comma, or is so placed in the context as to have its final syllable demonstrated by a parenthesis, or any other equivalent distinction. Thus if I say, "that the noun (*τίτηρ*) is an oxyton," as the termination of the word is in this case sufficiently designated by the parenthesis, it were actum agere, and a work of supererogation, to designate also its termination by the *final acute*. But Herman is mistaken, when he says that the oxyton *Ἄχιλλεὺς* in the following expression ought to have an acute accent, τὸ *Ἄχιλλεύς οὐομα* (de emendanda etc. p. 67); for

here as there is no stop, nor any thing in the nature of a stop, after the oxyton, Ἀχιλλεύς, to denote the final syllable, the final acute according to my Canon of Orthography is required. I will help Herman to a better, and the only, way of justifying the omission of the final acute in the foregoing expression, which is, that, as the oxyton is followed by a word having an *initial spirit* οὐομα, the final syllable of the oxyton may be thought to be *indirectly* indicated by this initial, and under such circumstances the omission of the final acute is certainly consistent with reason, if not with usage. For a similar reason perhaps Lascaris gives πάντι τ' ἀνθρώπων instead of πάντι τ' ἀνθρώπων. Medea, v. 13. 21. ed. Por.

Herman being entirely in the dark as to the true and simple cause of omitting the final acute on these occasions does not hesitate to supply from his own invention a reason for it, and gives us very gravely this amusing and highly metaphysical account of the matter. “Quam pronunciandi rationem uti *sponte sequitur vox*, ita etiam ipsa rei *Natura* veram esse docet. Nam orationis perpetuitate sublatâ, quæ unicè in constructionis continuatione posita est, erigi etiam accentum, quem constructio consopiverat, necesse est.” What is all this, but Nodum in scirpo quærere?

Unfortunately for Herman's hypothesis these grave accents of oxytons in the middle of a sentence, or accents set asleep (*consopiti accentus*), as he terms them, are frequently found not to be in motion (*erigi*) at the end of a sentence, but to remain even there in a *dormant* and *quiescent* state, notwithstanding the physical necessity that they should do otherwise. The ignorant transcribers of manuscripts, having as little knowledge of this physical necessity, as of the difference between Dr. Foster's apex of tone, and that of time above mentioned, have paid no sort of attention to it; for in Montfaucon's Palæographia we find many oxytons still retaining the *final acute*, although at the end of a sentence. See Palæographia, p. 217 at the word ιγιασμίν twice, p. 212. at the word πνευματικήν, p. 271. at the word ψυχή, and p. 274. at the word σοφί. Thus too Lascaris has printed at the end of a sentence αἰτῶ for αἴτοι. See Porson's Medea in Addenda et Corrigenda, p. 2. 1. 3.

I mention this circumstance as no otherwise material than to show the fallacy of those, who, like Herman and most others, would make us believe that there is a real essential difference, of some subtle property, but what they do not well know, between the very same oxytons in the middle, and at the end of a sentence, and that it is in the latter situation alone, that oxytons are genuine, and have the full force of acutes. The authors of this doctrine might as well pretend, that there is a difference in power between

the common and the final sigma, and puzzle themselves and others in endless researches after the quality of the supposed distinction. Heyne is the only critic, as far as I know, who is heretical enough to deny this article of what may be called the catholic faith of grammarians, and he has declared simply and boldly, *Qui acutus est in prioribus syllabis, idem est quoque acutus in ultimā, sive' sive' pingatur.* Homer. v. 5. p. 179.

The plain truth is, that though it would be a breach of a most useful law of orthography not to mark the concluding syllable of oxytons in the *middle* of a sentence with a final acute, it is no error, or at most an error on the safe side, to preserve the final acute even at the *end* of a sentence, and after a full stop, although the final syllable of the word in such a situation is sufficiently determined, independently of the accentual character, by punctuation alone. The retention therefore of the final acute in the preceding examples from Montfaucon and Lascaris may be considered as unnecessary, and superfluous, but is not faulty. In the same way, in our printed books, we not only put a full stop, where it is absolutely required, at the end of every sentence in close connexion and on the same line with a succeeding one, but, what is surprising, at the end of detached paragraphs, and of the book itself, and even after the declaratory *finis*, a mode of punctuation, that is innocent indeed, and may be allowed to custom, although not demanded by reason. In all these cases there is not a misdirection, but a double direction.

Whenever in short the end of a word is ascertainable by any other means than the final acute, the introduction of this character is unnecessary, and the oxytons may be marked with the common acute. Accordingly, oxytons are found so marked not only at the end of sentences, but at the end of verses, as in these lines of Theocritus :

εὐθα μιᾶς πολλοῖ κατὰ κλίμακος ἀμφοτέρων ἔξ
τοικων ἄνορες ἐβαινον Ἰητονίης ἀπὸ νηός.

See Herman, De emendandâ etc. p. 66,

Of a piece with the preceding principle is the omission, frequent in many manuscripts, and even in many printed books, of the initial lene, at the beginning of books, chapters, sentences, and verses. Now the reason of this omission is evident, for, if the use of the lene is only to mark the beginning of words, it may be well spared, wherever their beginning is as strongly marked by their position—For instance to set an initial sign before the first line of the *Odyssey*,

Ἄριστα μοι ἔννεπε, etc.

is a very unnecessary trouble. But to omit the *aspirate* at the beginning of a word is never justifiable, although sometimes done; as the aspirate has a double office, and is always useful as the sign

of a letter, where it may not be wanted as an initial sign.—So the aspirate should be retained both as an initial sign, and as a letter, whenever rho or hu, or as it is commonly called, upsilon, occur at the beginning of words placed in context, that is in the middle of a sentence, not only to mark the beginning of the word, but also to distinguish the initial rho and hu from the medial and final ro and upsilon; for there is the same difference between rho and ro, and hu and upsilon, as there is between phi, and pi; except that in hu the aspirate is a prefix, and in rho and phi, an affix to the principal letter. But whenever rho and hu occur not in context, and are placed at the head of a verse or sentence, the initial aspirate is better omitted, as it is not wanted as an initial sign, and its force as a spirit is included in the letters themselves, demanding uniformly and invariably an aspirate at the beginning of words. It is as ridiculous to write

"*Τύρων εἴνεκα τῆσδε* etc. and '*Ρίψε ποδὸς τεταγών*, etc.
with an initial aspirate, as it would be to write,

'*Θαρσήσας μάλα εἰπὲ*, etc.

with an aspirate to the theta. It is an abuse of the *initial* spirits, and a flat contradiction to their design, ever to place them in the *middle* of words. By what authority therefore, and to what advantage πυρρὸς and μυρρίν are decorated with an initial lene, and an initial aspirate, in the middle, I leave to the learned to determine. It appears to me that the peculiar force of the double rho is as intelligible from the use of two rhos, as that of the double gamma is from the use of two gammas, and that no greater index, than what the letters themselves afford, is required to inform us, either that πυρρὸς *flavus* is to be pronounced as pyrrhus, or that ἄγγελος is to be pronounced as angelus, expressed in latin characters.

An attention to the preceding observations may account for the absence of the common acute and acute final and of the spirits also, in the curious manuscript of the psaltery, written by Sedulius Scottus. A specimen of it is given in Montfaucon's *Palæographia* p. 237. In this manuscript every word is distinguished by a dot or full stop at the end of it. The ordinary accentual marks and spirits not being therefore wanted for this office of distinguishing words in context, they are altogether omitted, and the seat of the accent is denoted uniformly by a simple dot over the accented syllable. As in this mode of accentual notation no difference is made between the circumflex and the acute, it is probable that in the age of Sedulius Scottus no difference in pronunciation existed, and that the peculiar power of the circumflex had become lost to the Greeks of his time, as it is to the modern Greeks. I believe, it may be generally asserted, that wherever words are

distinguished by dots, or other devices at the end of them, there the regular accents are never introduced. On the contrary, in the example above cited, p. 25, where accents are placed on *every* word, without regard to tone, and merely to mark the *termination*, there a dot or stop after each word is not necessary, and is not therefore to be found, except after a few words, as a mark of abbreviation. There cannot, I think, exist a more clear relation of cause and effect, than what is exhibited by these two modes of notation, both never occurring together, but the one always officiating as a substitute for the other, and the whole amounts to demonstration, that a primary object of both dots, and accents, has been to assist the reader in the right division of words in context, by enabling him to discern quickly and at a glance their beginning and ending.

It may be thought by some, that the modern mode of distinguishing one word from another, by a space between them, is much more convenient, and that the mode of arriving at the same end by the apparatus of Spirits and Accents is comparatively very complex and cumbersome. I certainly do not mean to weigh, for a moment, together the comparative advantages of the two methods, but if we wish to form a fair estimate of the merit of the Greek method, we must not measure it by the present standard of Orthography, but should transport ourselves to the age, when it was invented, and have regard to the state and circumstances of literature at that period.

In this kind of criticism, more than in any other, we shall do the greatest injustice to our Predecessors, and expose the hastiness of our own judgment, unless we constantly bear in mind the sage maxim of Ovid,

Indicis officium est, ut res, ita tempora rerum
Cernere.

I have stated before, that it was one merit of the accentual marks, that they served at the same time the double purpose of marking the Tone and the Division of words. But they had another and even superior merit in being as applicable to *old* manuscripts as to *new*. The introduction of any method, however excellent in all other respects, if it had superseded and rendered obsolete and in a manner useless all pre-existing manuscripts, would on this account alone have been imperfect and exceptionable. It was a peculiar advantage belonging to the apparatus of Accents and Spirits, that it disturbed nothing, which it found established, and was a sort of new machinery, that could be affixed to the old, without displacing or effacing a single particle of the original.

There can be little doubt that many old manuscripts were soon furnished with it, and were rendered by this means much more

legible and valuable. It may readily be conceived too, that to apply this machinery, as it ought to be applied, that is, to divide each word rightly by it, so as to produce the best and true sense, (the context of ancient writers presenting till this period nothing but a confused mass of letters) was a task of immense labor, and one also that required much sagacity, taste, knowledge, and judgment. No wonder therefore, that the greatest scholars of antiquity did not think it beneath them to exercise their talents in this species of criticism. In this pursuit, Aristarchus, the worthy pupil of the father of the invention, we are told,¹ was indefatigable, and spent a long life of meritorious industry, (the fruits of which we to this day experience) in the correction of Homer, and no less than *eight hundred* other authors.¹ Among the Latins Valerius Probus dedicated himself to the like studies. According to Suetonius, (De illustr. Gramm. b. 24.) multa exemplaria *contracta* (that is, as I apprehend, not abbreviated, but procured by purchase, or otherwise) emendare, ac *distinguere*, et adnotare curavit, soli huic nec ulli præterea Grammaticis parti deditus. At a later period the same practice continued, and Montfaucon suspects, that to many of the most ancient manuscripts in capitals the Accents, Spirits, and Stops have been added by a later hand. Palæogr. p. 196, and 217.

If this ingenious invention of Marks for the division of words had been founded on principles merely *arbitrary*, it would have taken nothing from its utility. It is however a further topic of recommendation, that it seems founded on the very nature of speech, as it is by Accent chiefly that one word in pronunciation is distinguishable from another. Orthography therefore in this instance is in strict unison with Pronunciation, and the criterion, adopted to distinguish words to the eye of the reader, is the very one, which existed, previously to the invention of any character, in the mouth of the speaker. On this subject the observations of our English Grammarian, Lindley Murray, appear to me very judicious, and as they are apposite to the present point I will cite them. "As words may be formed," he says, "of a different number of syllables, from one to eight or nine, it was necessary to have some peculiar mark to distinguish words from mere syllables; otherwise speech would be only a continued succession of syllables, without conveying ideas: for as words are the marks of ideas, any confusion in the marks must cause the same in the ideas, for which they stand. It was therefore necessary that the mind should at once perceive what number of syllables belongs to each word, in utterance. The English tongue has, for this purpose, adopted a mark of the easiest and simplest kind, which is

called Accent, and which effectually answers the end¹! Of the justice of these observations any one may be convinced who attends to the difference of pronunciation between the single word, *holydays*, and the two divided words, *holy days*, and between the country, *Newfoundland*, and the three divided words, *new found land*. The same distinction holds good in Latin and in Greek. Thus *crucifigo*, *ususcaptio*, or *plebiscitum* with one Accent is one word, but divided into *cruci figo*, *usūs captio*, etc. they become two words, and each requires a separate Accent. In Greek too we find many compounds written indifferently sometimes with one Accent as one word, and sometimes resolved into their constituent parts, with a separate accent to each part, as *παραυτίκα*, or *παρ' αὐτίκα*, *πιτοπολὺ*, or *ἐπὶ τῷ πολὺ*, *σύνδο*, or *σὸν δό*, *σύμπαντες*, or *σὸν πάντες*, etc. The curious may see a large collection of such words in Duker's Preface to Thucydides. Some imagine that in the French Language there are no accents, but this is a mistake. The pronunciation of French is certainly more even, and less strongly accented, than our own, and this quality renders it peculiarly favorable to double meanings. The Parisians are therefore great punsters, and a great deal of their wit turns upon a slight of pronunciation. Of this nature is the pun mentioned by Lord Blayney, and applied by the wits of Paris to Buonaparte, *Le char l'attend*, or *Le charlatan*. Narrative etc. Vol. 2. p. 101. In English too, as well as in Latin and Greek, there are many weak unemphatic words, chiefly monosyllables, more rarely dissyllables, that coalesce with others into one word, and receive together with their principal but one Accent. We have therefore in effect, though not in name, both Enclitics and Proclitics. What is meant by Proclitics, a word coined, I believe, by Herman, and not unhappily, will best be explained by Herman himself. *Præter Encliticas aliud genus dictionum extat accentum suum deponentium, quas Procliticas nominare placet, quia accentum non in præcedente, sed in sequente vocabulo deponunt.* De emendandâ etc. p. 96. This analogy of many English words to Enclitics has been well observed by Dr. Valpy, who has given in his Greek Grammar the following familiar example of it: "When we say, *give me that book*, we pronounce *me* as part of the word *give*."² There is no doubt, but that *give me* is in this instance as much one word to the ear,

¹ Vol. 1. P. 329.

² P. 166. Third ed. I think I may say without partiality, that this Grammar contains more useful information for its size, than any other Grammar extant. It gives a compendious view of the fruits of modern research together with much original and ingenious matter. At the same time, and with all due deference to the great authorities both at home and abroad from whom I differ, I can never give my entire approbation to this, or to

as *prithee*, or *methinks*, although the latter are not only pronounced, but always written as one word. In the following phrase, *on-which-account*, we use always three words in writing, but pronounce them, I think, frequently as one word, like *quamobrem* in Latin, giving an accent to the middle word *which*, while both the first and last words lose their Accent, the one as a Proclitic, the other as an Enclitic. The tendency to multiply Enclitics, and to make small words coalesce into one in pronunciation by the subtraction of Accent, is very observable among common people, and children. These, if desired to repeat the Lord's Prayer, generally begin in this manner : "Our Father, *which-art* in Heaven," making *art* as the Greeks do *ἰστήν*, an Enclitic. In the familiar expression, thinks—I, says—I, etc. the verb becomes a Proclitic, and the pronoun takes the accent. This habit of dropping Accents is a most fruitful source of contractions and abbreviations in most languages. To this we owe our *anight* and *asleep*, for *at night* and *at sleep*, the Hebrews their Affixes and Prefixes, the Latins and Greeks the terminations of their cases and tenses, which are probably latent prepositions and pronouns, the Germans their *zum* for *zu dem*, the French their *au* for *a le*, and the Italians their *colla* and *nella*, for *con ella*, and *in ella*.¹ To conclude, the general principle, upon

any other Grammar, which deviates from the established number of Declensions and Conjugations, as taught and referred to by the Greek Grammarians themselves. There can be but one reason for this deviation, and that is, to assist the Scholar. It is worth while therefore to ascertain how much his labor is abridged by the consolidation of Declensions and Conjugations. If we compare the Accidents in Dr. Valpy's Grammar, with those in the Eton Grammar, and leave out of consideration the notes in both, it may be asserted, that there are not *ten* pages of text to be learned less in one Grammar, than in the other. This therefore is the just amount of labor saved to the pupil. Now let me ask, what is the value of this saving to a boy, whose time is not very precious, and whose memory is fresh and active, and cannot well be too much exercised? But are we sure, that even this saving is a real and clear gain? On the contrary, when he is an adult, and comes to the reading of the Greek Scholiasts, Commentators, and Grammarians, will he not find them perfectly unintelligible in all their grammatical allusions upon the principles of the New Grammar? The old Grammar must be got by heart at last, by those who would understand the old Grammarians, and surely it is much better to learn their Grammar at first, and once for all, at little or no waste of time and trouble, than afterwards at a very great one. It is making two scaffoldings necessary, where one alone might be sufficient. At all events, the Grammars that adopt the new method, should contain short notices of the old system of conjugations and declensions. Dr. V. would leave little to desire, if he attended to this suggestion in a future edition.

¹ Antonini in his dictionary calls *Ne*, preposizione, in vice di *in*, evidently taking *la*, and not *ella*, to be the article. To clear this doubt, I take the articles *il*, *lo* and *la* to be corruptions of the Latin *illo*, and *illa*, *il* suffering an apocope, and *lo* and *la* an aphæresis. It is only after the preposition *in*, that the extended forms, *illo*, and *illa*, passing into *ello* and

which I have expatiated so widely, that words are defined by Accents, is confirmed by Quintilian, and is neatly delivered in this short sentence. *Est autem in omni voce utique Acuta, sed numquam plus unā Lib. 1. 65.* Donatus too speaks to the same effect. *Præpositio separatim adverbii non applicabitur, quamvis legerimus desursum, desubito, derepente, et exinde, et abusque, et dehinc; sed hæc tanquam unam partem orationis sub uno accentu pronunciabimus.* In Putschio, 1761.

The Latins in imitation of the Greeks introduced the grave accent or final acute on the few oxytons which occur in their language, as I have noticed before. But there is no reason to believe, either from Manuscripts or Inscriptions, that the Greek accentual system was ever generally received into the Latin language. On the contrary the Latin scribes neglected Spirits altogether, and applied frequently the Greek accentual characters to other purposes, than that of accent. Sometimes, as we have noticed already, they applied the common acute to the purpose of denoting quantity, and sometimes as a mere final character to denote the end of each word, without any relation either to quantity or tone. With equal consistency and propriety, (as it will not, I apprehend, be contended, that there is any thing inviolable in these oblique strokes, and which in the nature of things can make them fit signs of one quality in language, more than of another,) the Latin scribes at other times, and on some occasions, seem to make use of the grave or final acute as a mere sign of termination to certain words. We have at least a peculiar instance of the Latin usage of these strokes, in opposition to the Greek usage of them, in the Latin ablatives and genitives, *Famā* and *Luctūs*. Here the common acute seems placed to show that the syllable is *long by nature*, and the grave or final acute is added to it, to shew that it is *final*. Those only, who will give a Greek accentual power to these oblique strokes, wherever they find them, whether in Greek or out of Greek, and, because they represent accents in Greek, will not allow them to represent any other quality and perform a different office in any other language, can be offended at this Latin mode of Notation. It is in this manner, that the circumflex, which takes place in *famā*, and *luctūs*, has been a stumbling-block to many modern grammarians, who misapprehending the Latin use of the character, and supposing it to be necessarily characteristic of tone, and identified in power with the

ella, like *impius* and *index*, into *empio*, and *endice*, are still preserved, and in this single instance they may be considered as articles. *Ello* is now quite obsolete, but *Ella* is still used as a Nomiuative Pronoun, and even in the oblique cases by the Poets, as in Tasso,

Matilda il volse, e nutricollo, e instrusse

Nell'arti regie, e sempre ei fù conella. Gie. Lib. Cant. 1. st. 59.

I write therefore purposely *nell'arti*, and not *ne l'arti*, as some Editions have it.

Greek circumflex, have objected to what they did not understand, and have busied themselves with combating a phantom of their own creation. To those who love to see Latin and Greek measured by one standard, it must doubtless be a sort of consolation to reflect, that if in *Famā* and *Luctūs* the circumflex is a barbarous notation, yet, when the same words are followed by an enclitic, as in *Famáque* and *Luctūsque*, the circumflex becomes an accentual notation, in strict conformity to the canons of Prosody.

Having developed my general doctrine respecting the subserviency of Accents and Spirits to the purpose of reading, and having endeavoured to explain by it some usages peculiar to Greek Orthography, I do not know how I can give a still more forcible impression of the truth of it, than by one short *practical* illustration. For this end I will set down an inscription without accents, stops, or spirits, taken at random from Dr. Clarke's Travels, V. 3, p. 774, exactly as it is found there, except that, to save trouble, I shall express it in small characters instead of capitals. It was discovered at Eleusis on a marble Pedestal, and is as follows.

ηεξαρειοπαγου
βουληκαιηβουλη
των φκαιοδημος
οαθηγαιωνχλαυδι
αυμενανδρανχλαν
διουφιλιππουσου
δαδουχησαντοσθυατε
ραχλαιδεμοστρατουσεγ
γονοναιλπραξαγορουα
πογονοναιρετησενεκεν.

That is,

Of Areopagus
the council, and the councel
of 500, and the people
of the Athenians to Claudi-
a Menandra, of Clau-
dius Philippus the
torch-bearer daugh-
ter, of Claudius Emostratus grand-
daughter, of Ælius Praxagoras great-
granddaughter, for virtue's sake—

I will now put the stops to it, which will immediately throw some light upon the mass, but still leave it not perfectly discernible in all its parts.

ηεξαρειοπαγου	οαθηγαιων, χλαυδι
βουλη, καιηβουλη	αυμενανδραν, χλαν
τωνφ, καιοδημος	διουφιλιππουσου

δαδουχησαντοςθυγατρι
ορ, κληδεμοστρατουσεγ
γονον, αιλπραξαγορουχ
πογανον, αρετη;ευκεν.

The effect of the stops, it is evident, is only to show the members and divisions of the sentence ; they still leave in a state of confusion all the intermediate words. I will now write the inscription over again, and in addition to the stops will add the accents and spirits. The stops may be said to illuminate the general outline, and principal members, but it is only the accents and spirits, that make the minuter parts discernible, and discover each separate feature and lineament.

ἡξάγειοπάγου
βουλή, καιήβουλή
τῶν\$, καλόδημος
οὐθηνάιων, κλανί^ς
αγμενάνδραν, κλαν
δίου\$ιλίππουτοῦ
δαδουχησαντοζη
γατέρα, κλανδιμιστρίγουεγ
γονον, αιλπραξαγόρουκ
πογονον, αρετη;ευκεν.

In this short inscription there are no less than thirteen initial, and four final characters. Who does not immediately perceive the great facility afforded to reading by this simple invention, and that the sentence is not only broken into its component members by stops, but that by the help of accents and spirits every word almost is divided, and distinguished from its companions. If we do not read the lines by the help of accents and spirits quite so well as if they were written in the modern manner with a space between each word, a good deal of this difficulty is imputable to want of use, and would become less, and almost vanish entirely by repeated trials, and continued application to ancient manuscripts. Still, however unaccustomed we are to read by accents, if two persons, one conversant with the doctrine of accents, and the other not, attempt to read the three following verses of Euripides, written without spaces between the words, but properly accented, I have no doubt which will arrive at the end sooner, as every word in them is separated and distinguished by accents and spirits.

ἀρούκεπαδδο; καιγόησπέφυχ' ὅδε,
διτήνέμηπέπιοθενένεργητία

ψυχήνκρατήσειντοτεχόντ' ἀτιμάτας. Hippolytus, 1041.

I have just shown the light, that is thrown into all inscriptions and manuscripts by the application of accents and spirits. As a sort of reverse to this, and as nothing tends more to strengthen a position, than the support derived from contrast, I will now

show a few of the many mistakes that may arise, or have arisen, from the want or neglect of these orthographical instruments. I will begin with a difficulty, that occurs in the preceding inscription. I have considered the letters $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$ as composing two words, namely, $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta$, an abbreviation for $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta\iota\omega\upsilon$, and $\varepsilon\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$. But I am by no means sure, that I have divided the letters rightly, as $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta$ might stand for $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta\iota\omega\upsilon$, and then the last word would be $\delta\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$, a name more common, than $\varepsilon\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$. The substitution of the epsilon for an eta might be the mistake of the transcriber, as Dr. Clarke has committed a similar error in writing $\Theta\epsilon\tau\omega\zeta$ for $\Theta\eta\sigma\zeta\omega\zeta$. vol. 3. p. 351. On the other hand $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta$, I believe, is an unusual abbreviation for $\chi\lambda\varepsilon\delta\iota\omega\upsilon$. Whichever may be the right reading, it is clear that, had accents and spirits been used in this inscription, the dilemma, whether the word in question be $\delta\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$ or $\varepsilon\mu\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\upsilon$, that is, whether it begin with a vowel, or a consonant, could not have existed. The presence or absence of the initial spirit would have decided this matter.

I know that Dawes treats all these orthographical distinctions with great levity. In his *Miscellanea Critica*, p. 76, he breaks out in this manner. *Suavissimi Argutatores! verbi notionem accentus sedes, accentus autem sedem verbi notio vicissim determinat!* Ni hoc sit in circulo, quod aiunt, disputare, quid tandem esse poterit? This is a sophism unworthy so great a Critic. Beyond all doubt, the sense, to be collected from the context, and from a knowledge of the subject, is the best and only interpreter of equivocal passages, but, occurring as these do frequently, and almost in every page, is it worth while to let them remain, and occasion, as we proceed, doubt and discussion at every step, when by a stroke of the pen they can be removed? If an Aristarchus has been able to extract from letters a better reading, than what has been commonly adopted, is it not a great advantage to be able to communicate this reading, to register, as it were, the amendment, and to prevent a relapse into error by the expeditious and simple means of notation? Does he mean to say, that while all other arts are brought to perfection by adopting from time to time such aids as experience suggests, Orthography is a thing to be let alone, and incapable of receiving any improvement? Was it commendable in the old Greeks not to trust to the sense only to know, whether *AOI* be a dative singular, or a nominative plural, but to determine this matter by the invention of a new character, omega, and could it be wrong in the later Greeks to put an end to difficulties attending other words by the invention of other characters equally decisive? I will not deny that these distinctions have been multiplied sometimes beyond the due occa-

sion for them, so as to breed disgust in men of taste, intent on more important matters, and that it is to be regretted that grammarians have not always imposed on themselves the caution inculcated to Poets,

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus.

I will now proceed to the notice of a singular mistake, that occurs in the psaltery, from a wrong division of the letters. In the first psalm, at the 4th verse, there is the following line.

ἀλλ' ἡ ὡς ὁ χνοῦς, ὃν ἐκρίπτει ὁ ἀνεμός,

I conceive that there may be two errors in it, occasioned by a misarrangement of the letters, as they are exhibited in the copy of the psaltery by Sedulius Scottus before referred to. In Sedulius Scottus the line is thus written, and divided,

αλλη. ως. ςχνους. ον. εκριπτη. (sic) ο. ανεμως (sic).

The first blunder is in Sedulius, who has wrongly divided the three letters *ωση*, and made out of one word two, namely out of *ωση*, *ως η*. The right word indeed is *ωσῃ*, corruptly written after the fashion of the middle ages *ωσὴ*, of which corruption another instance occurs in the very same line, *ἐκρίπτη* being put in like manner for *ἐκρίπτει*. Montfaucon (Palæogr. p. 238) has improved upon this blunder, and supposing the *η* to be a false concord, has substituted *ὁ* the masculine article before *χνοῦς*, in his explanation of the text. It is however, I think, impossible to suppose, that any person could be so negligent, as to write *ἡ χνοῦς ὃν ἐκρίπτει*, with the *feminine* article immediately before the noun, and with a *masculine* relative pronoun immediately succeeding it. This amendment, however, of Montfaucon's is as old as the Alexandrine Manuscript of the Psaltery, now, fortunately for the literary world, made public by the care of Mr. Baber, where *ςχνους* in capitals appears distinctly enough.

Again the Alexandrine Manuscript has *ἀλλη*, which may be either one word, or two words, either *ἀλλγ*, or *ἀλλ' ἡ*, for the iota subscript is neither expressed in this manuscript, nor in that of Sedulius. But Sedulius, who puts a dot at the end of every word to distinguish it from its companions, gives us plainly *ἀλλη* as one word, and this I submit is the true reading, and makes the best sense.

Upon the whole the reading in the manuscript of Sedulius, *ωσῃ ςχνος* is just as good as *ως ὁ ςχνος*, which is in the Alexandrine and common copies, and the other reading of *ἀλλη* for *ἀλλ' ἡ* seems preferable.

In the manuscript of Sedulius the letters are all right, but a dot has been misplaced after *ως*, which ought to have been placed after *ωσῃ*. If we read it in this manner,

αλλη. ωσῃ. ςχνος. ον. εκριπτη ο.ανεμως

that is, alia ratione (scelesti sunt) sicut gluma, quam projicit ventus, there is not only no error, and no need of any correction, but perhaps too the best sense is afforded, and the true text restored.

There can be little doubt also that the mistake of ηδεστρεπον for ἡδεῖ, which Boyle fell into in his edition of Phalaris, and which the sagacious Bentley preys upon with triumphant humor,¹ originated in a wrong division of letters. In some old manuscript, written in capitals without accents, now perhaps no longer extant, but the parent of more modern manuscripts, the characters were these ΗΔΙ, the final η being substituted, as usual, for the diphthong ει. These characters some copyists understood properly, and, when they transcribed the capitals into small characters, with all the apparatus of accents, spirits, and stops, divided the three letters into two words ἡ δεῖ while other copyists, more attentive to the letters, than the sense, wrote it as one word ηδεῖ. If this conjecture as to the origin of the mistake is true, and the foundation of it was laid in the old manner of writing in capitals without accents, it is a circumstance, that furnishes an additional argument in confirmation of the antiquity of these forged Epistles of Phalaris, since there is no example, I believe, of any Greek manuscript in capitals of a date posterior to the eighth century.

It is so difficult to read and divide always rightly letters, when totally destitute of auxiliary characters, that the accurate and experienced Montfaucon has himself sometimes fallen into an error. In an Inscription in his Diarium Italicum, p. 53, he gives the following line according to his explanation of the original letters,

τὸ πνεῦμα τῆτ' ἔχοντι προΐσθου,

and renders it thus :

in quo spiritum tuum habenti ipsum commendasti ;
But in his Palaeographia he divides the letters τωτεχοντι more properly, and to the great improvement of the sense, into these words, τῷ τεχόντι, and thus translates it,

in quo spiritum tuum Patri commendasti.

Having just seen that the greatest scholars, and those most conversant with manuscripts, are not always on their guard against mistakes, I shall not, I trust, be thought censorious, if I take the liberty of pointing out an error in a late publication by Mr. Gaisford, entitled, Notitia Manuscriptorum, especially as this error may not attach to the learned Editor, but is probably that of the manuscript itself.

I will transcribe the whole distich, as it exhibits in a small compass three observable qualities; a wrong division of letters into

¹ Bentleyi opuscula, Lipsiae, 1781, p. 39.

words, an almost indiscriminate substitution of *η*, *ει*, and *ι*, one for the other, and syllabic metre, or rather verse, (for metre it is none) without regard to quantity.

The lines, as printed, p. 9, are these,

ἡ μὲν χειρὶ γράψασα σπέται τάφω.
εἰ δὲ θεῖα βύζλος εἰς αἰῶνα μένη.

That is, according to present orthography,

ἡ μὲν χειρὶ ἡ γράψασα σῆπεται τάφω.
εἰ δὲ θεῖα βύζλος εἰς αἰῶνα μένει.

If there can be any doubt whether this be the right reading, it must disappear on reference to Montfaucon's Palæogr. p. 292, where the first line occurs nearly in the same words, but so arranged as to make metre, while the second line is spun out into a *politic* or *vulgar verse*, resembling that of the modern Greeks, consisting of fifteen syllables, divided into Hemistichs, one of eight and the other of seven syllables,

¹ Eze in his Grammatica Gothica prefixed to the Gothic gospels of Bezaelius p. 20, observes justly, *ī* initialis est vocis aut syllabe : at I adharet precedenti littere. Sic in Alexandino N. T. codice MS. memini olim me legisse, ΙΑΤΡΟΥ. ΙΟΥΔΑΟΥ. ΙΔΟΝΤΕΟ. ΕΞΙΓΤΑΝΤΟ. ΠΡΩΙ. I will add, that as the initial *ī* sufficiently distinguishes the beginning of words, the initial lene is therefore in many manuscripts omitted. v. Greg. de Dialectis, Lipsiae, 1811, p. 590. In like manner *Υ* or *υ* serves not only the same purposes as *ī*, but sometimes also a *third* purpose, namely that of distinguishing the *consonant u* or Beta, pronounced by the modern Greeks, and probably by those of the middle ages like our *v*, from the *vowel Upsilon*. Thus in Montfaucon's Palæographia p. 282, *ελαυομεν* occurs for *ελαβομεν*, and in the Alexandrine MS. p. 555 *parauola*, for *parabola*. This equivalency, and consequent commutation of the Upsilon and Beta has been a fruitful source of doubt, especially as to the right pronunciation of proper names, and to this day whether we ought to write *Σανή*, *Δανίδ*, etc. or *Σαβή*, *Δαβίδ*, &c. "Grammatici certant, et adhuc sub judice lis est."

My own conjecture is, that the ancient Greeks, and even those under the Ptolemies acknowledged no other power in the Upsilon than that of the vowel sound; but that subsequently it became hardened, when placed between two vowels, into the consonant *V*, and finally was converted into the letter *B*, to prevent equivocation. The modern Greeks, it is well known, pronounce Upsilon as a consonant, in many cases, as in *βασιλεὺς* and *αὐτός*, and it is probable that from *αὐτός*, pronounced like *atus* or *aptus*, is derived the Latin *ipsum*, or *ipse*, and from *ἐαυτοῦ*, *suāptē* and *suopte*. On the contrary the Latins in other words have preserved the vowel sound, as in *dōmūi*, *necūi*, *monūi*, *posūi*, contracted from *domavi*, *necavi*, *monevi*, *posivi*, etc. and in the poetic words *dissoluit* and *siluit*. Porson in his Addenda to the Medea of Euripides, v. 1106, takes notice of this custom of placing two points over the letters *I* and *Υ*, but has not explained the use of them.

ἢ χειρὶ μὲν ἡ γράψασα σήπετε (l. σύγκεται) τάφῳ,
γραψεῖ (l. γραψή) δέ μένη (l. μένει) πρὸς χρόνους πολλοὺς, δόξα τῷ
Θεῷ.

But to no purpose is the application of spirits and accents more valuable than to the illustration of ancient inscriptions. The following Epigram, taken from Dr. Clarke's Greek Marbles (P.5) which the learned Editor seems to despair of translating, will lose much of its supposed difficulty, if not all, by the simple method of clothing the text with accents, and spirits.

Τειμόθεος ὄπά τραϊστοις φῶς παιᾶς δέ θασεῖος
Τριζδεκάταις ιτέαντερ ματίσας εἴθανες
Ατάλανοι κτείνωσε πολυχλαυστῷ πλεπτότύμβῳ
Πλὺνθεστὸν ἥρών χῶρον ἔχοις φθίμενος.

According to the orthography of the middle ages, *τειμόθεος* occurs for *τιμόθεος*, *τρις* for *τρεῖς*, and *δεκάταις* for *δεκάδας*. By a like change of letter the Italians have made their *Torso* from *Dorsum*.

The Epigram may be thus translated into Latin.

Timotheus, patriæ sacra lux, Dasiique propago,
Triginta annorum tempora mensus, obis.

Te, miser, ad tumulum miseror sine fine dolendum ;
Mortuus Heroum sed loca pulchra colas.

Enough has been said by this time, and perhaps more than enough, to prove the value of accents and spirits as auxiliaries to the art of reading, and as a mode of *verbal* punctuation, if I may so call it, in opposition to common punctuation, which is only *sentential*. Never had there been a greater obligation conferred on the literary world, than by the invention of accents, at the time of their introduction; and although the subsequent invention of printing has superseded the old method of reading by accents, and has by spaces between words, and other devices, rendered the process of reading still more unembarrassed and rapid, still we, who enjoy these superior advantages, ought not to be unmindful of our Grammatical Precursors, and of the great Founder and Father of orthography, Aristophanes of Byzantium.—All antiquity concurred in paying him just honor; but modern Grammarians, not understanding the full scope of his design, have holden both him and his invention cheap, and in Chalmers' Universal Biography, a repository, where every son of fame might expect to find admission, not a niche is allowed to his memory. A single friend, however, and one πολλῶν ἀντάξιος ἄλλων, Dr. Foster of Eton, with a zeal worthy of his learning, and characteristic of a true scholar, has vindicated the character of Aristophanes and expatiated on his merit. He has concluded a long and animated defence of him, and his labors, by declaring “that *Posterity* hath been more truly and essentially benefited by

the ingenuity of this learned Greek, than by the writings of any one profane author of antiquity."¹ When the learned writer passed this encomium, he was himself only imperfectly acquainted with the extent of the utility of Aristophanes' inventions. He considers him chiefly as the inventor of common punctuation, of those marks, that indicate the division of *sentences* into colons and commas. But I have shown in a preceding part of this paper, that a species of punctuation was practised in Aristotle's time, and that this art therefore is not an invention of Aristophanes, although it is probable that it received from his skill and ingenuity very great improvement. The principal ground of Aristophanes' title to the gratitude of posterity is his invention of the *accentual marks*, and his happy adaptation of them to the *double* purpose of denoting tone, and the division of words. This division of words is infinitely more useful, because of more frequent occurrence, and therefore more wanted, than the division of sentences. Those, who are conversant with inscriptions, and ancient unaccented manuscripts, and who know by experience the great fatigue and the great difficulty of reading, or rather of decyphering and unriddling a long line of letters, arrayed without any discrimination of words, or periods, are alone capable fully to represent to their imagination what must have been the condition of readers before the invention of stops, spirits, and accents, and can alone appreciate the immense saving of time and trouble gained principally by the improvements and inventions of Aristophanes. To him therefore, to the revered name of Aristophanes, who may be said to have brought to light not only Philosophy, but Poetry, and History, and all that is valuable in every department of literature, I do not hesitate to apply this affectionate apostrophe of *Lucre-tius*,

E tenebris tantis tam claram extollere lucem
Qui primus potuisti, illustrans commoda vitæ,
Te sequor, O Graicæ gentis decus, inque tuis nunc
Fixa pedum pono pressis vestigia signis..

I had written the whole of this essay, and prepared almost the whole of it for the press, when, in a friend's library, I met with Reizius de Prosodiæ Græcæ Accentus Inclinatione. On looking into the work, p. 3, I find two reasons assigned by him for the deposition of the acute accent in oxytons, and for the representation of it by a grave. One is, that the reader should be reminded by this mark, that the acute has not been omitted by mistake, and that the introduction of the grave should operate as a caution not to give an acute to any preceding syllable. Another reason

¹ On accent, p. 191.

is, that if no accent whatever were given to an oxyton, it would seem to form part of the ensuing word, and to coalesce with it. To prevent this effect, the grave is introduced, not as a tone, either elevating or depressing the voice, but as a direction, that the final syllable is to be pronounced more strongly and fully than the rest. He explains his meaning by the following illustration.

Unum clarissimum in particula ω ; exemplum habemus. Ea carens accentu gravis est per se, atque adeo pronunciatur ut pars vocabuli quod proxime sequitur. Eadem acuta, ω ;, pro $\epsilon\tau\alpha$;, quum in appositione acutum in gravem convertit, nisi pronunciatur et sine ulla tenoris elevatione, et sono tamen impulsò validius, oratio sit obscura. Nam si quis hanc particulam in his aut similibus verbis, $\omega\alpha\alpha\phi\omega\eta\sigma\alpha\epsilon\pi\beta\eta\sigma\alpha\tau\omega$, cum tenoris elevatione pronunciat, is videbitur verba disjunctisse, atque hoc dicere voluisse, *Ita : ergo locutus abiit.* Sin gravat quidem illam, sed non pronunciat sono magis intento, perit, quod erat inter ω et ω discrimen. Putabimus hoc dici, *Ut igitur locutus abiit*, et membrum consequens expectabimus: frustrati, sero intelligemus non hoc dici, sed illud, *Sic igitur locutus abiit.* Ergo et particula hæc, et ejus exemplo ultima quæque syllaba, gravis ex acuta facta, eo pronuncianda sono est, qui aures paullo plus impletat, quam is quo ceteræ syllabæ graves pronunciantur. p. 4.

There is something in this hypothesis very ingenious, and even specious, but I shall not stop to examine into the truth of it, as the learned author himself abandons it, and adopts another hypothesis more agreeable to my own.

P. 62, He has the following observation. Pagina 3. quas duas causas attuli, cur syllaba ultima tenore acuto, in constructione amissio, nota insigniretur gravis tenoris, cas quum non satis idoneas judicarein, quærenti mihi amplius, videbatur ejus rei verior causa hæc esse, quod olim ita scribebant, ut omnia vocabula inter se nexa cohærerent, nec ullo intervallo posterius a priore distaret. Quum ergo semel introducta esset consuetudo scribendi accentus, quoniam videbant eam rem etiam *ad singula vocabula dīrimenda* opportune inservire, ideo in syllaba ultima quæ acutum depositisset, gravem utique notandum putaverunt. Itaque hodie, quum in scribendo vocabulorum interstitia fieri soleant, accentus *gravis* omitti sane posset, ut etiam spiritus lenis.

When I came to this passage, I could not help exclaiming to myself, Euge, dexter, scopum attigisti ! not without feeling at the moment a little chagrin, and the force of the sentiment, Malè sit illis qui ante nos nostra dixerint. But as truth only is my object, it is always welcome, whencesoever it may proceed, and I cheerfully yield the merit of the discovery, on which I had plumed

myself a little, to this learned German. It is indeed a satisfaction to me to find my own opinion confirmed by that of so eminent a scholar, who has paid the greatest attention to all that concerns prosody and metre. My only surprise is, that afterwards, p. 66, he seems disposed to relapse into his first opinion, and to consider the introduction of the grave as a mere caution to young scholars, that they are to abstain from giving to the words marked with it an acute. His words are, *Itaque consultum veteres arbitrabantur, ut animi labor tironi minueretur, oculis ejus objicere signum consopiendi acuti. Videbant enim, si omisso eo signo tironem ipsum ratiocinari oporteret, dictionem gravandam esse, aut animum ejus hic occupatum aliquid aliud posse, negligere; aut animo ejus alibi occupato, fieri posse, ut consuetudine abreptus dictionem acueret.*

Now, with submission to Reizius and many other Grammarians, I contend on the contrary, that there is no such thing as deposition, or consopition of the acute, and that the grave affixed to oxytons is not a negative quality, implying a prohibition of the acute, but a positive quality, and a direction, that it is to be pronounced as an acute, and as an oxyton *χατ'* εξωχήν. Upon any other basis, how many difficulties, perplexities, and contradictions occur, which refuse to admit of any solution, but what is most refined and far-fetched. If ω; for οὐτως is an oxyton only at the end of a sentence, but in the middle of a sentence a baryton, then how is it distinguishable, in the name of common sense, from ω; without accent to the *ear*? Reizius found himself oppressed by the weight of this consideration, and has endeavoured, as we have seen, to extricate himself from the embarrassment, by supposing that, although ω; and ω; are similar in tone, and both grave alike, and equally different from the tone of οὐ, yet ω; is to be distinguished from ω;, by a greater volume of voice, and that the latter is to be pronounced *piano*, and the former *forte*. But is not this attributing to Greek accents a power wholly unsupported by any authority, and in contradiction to their quality of tone, which alone they are acknowledged to indicate? In another place, p. 2. Reizius condescends to countenance and adopt, what may be called the common cant of grammarians, who, instead of candidly confessing their ignorance, have invented the most absurd reasons for the expression of a final acute by a grave, but still, it should seem, from the currency, which these reasons have obtained, not too absurd, but good enough, for the generality of their readers. In this strain Reizius gravely asserts, *Propter continuum structuræ ordinem cursus pronunciationis debet perpetuus esse, quem interrumperet ultima syllaba dictionis mediae acuendo elata.* Herman, who, when he does blunder, seldom does it by halves, plunges much deeper into the mire, and assuming the same principle decides, that *an Oxyton in the middle of a sentence requires a grave accent, on*

the tyrant's plea of necessity. He says (*De Emendanda Ratione*, etc. p. 65.) "Grammatici quum animadverterent, vocabula oxytona in media oratione minus posse, quam in fine orationis acui, quia vehementius acuendis numerum, quo universa oratio continetur, interrumpi necesse esset, ea vocabula gravi, quem vocant, accentu notanda existimarentur." Ἀνάγκη μεγάλη θεὸς, and Herman thinks so, for he seldom has a difficulty, without applying to her for assistance. But let me ask what becomes of this necessity, when oxytons not only can, but do receive an acute even in the middle of a sentence, in two cases of very frequent occurrence; that is, whenever an oxyton is followed by an Enclitic, and whenever an oxyton declinable suffers an apocope? In the phrase τέρπν' ἔπαθοι, is not τέρπν' so placed an oxyton? Do not many barytons also become oxytons by apocope, in effect, although not in name, as in this line

'Ιλέλιος δ', δις πάντ' ἐφορῆς, καὶ πάντ' ἐπακούεις?

Now if in the preceding words τέρπν', and πάντ', thus apostrophized, the common or proper acute, instead of the final acute, is preserved, it is not because these words are not oxytons in effect as much as τερπνὰ and καὶ, but because the final syllable of these words being demonstrated, *first* by the apostrophus, and *secondly* by the initial lene immediately succeeding; a *third* mark of the same tendency, or the introduction of the final acute, has been thought superfluous. In the Medea by Lascaris a *double* sign does occur, whether by design or accident I know not, for he gives παντί τ' ἀνθρώπων, with a *final acute* before the enclitic τ' apostrophized, and not παντί τ' ἀνθρώπων. Vide Porsoni *Ad-denda*, &c. p. 2. l. 3.

The simple truth is, that the acute has two characters, one common or proper, and the other final, and that its power is precisely the same under all circumstances, whether represented by the acute proper, or the grave. The grave, or as I call it, the final acute, is the characteristic of oxytons, and is uniformly applied to them, except either when their last syllable ceases to be a final quality, as being incorporated with some enclitic, or when its final quality is otherwise sufficiently demonstrated, by a full stop, comma, close of a verse, apostrophus, or some other equivalent sign of separation. In the former case the use of the final acute is improper, in the latter superfluous. When an oxyton becomes a real grave, and loses its power, it is then very properly destitute of accentual marks, as in παντί ἀνθρώπου. In this case the preposition becomes a proclitic, and forms with its principal but one word.

DE LECTIONE Κηροπλάστας IN ARCHILOCHI
FRAGM. AP. PLUTARCHUM.

E. H. BARKERI *Epistola ad Th. Gaisfordium, Gr.
Ling. Profess. Reg. Oxon.*

Abunde laborum meorum fructum percepero, si tibi, doctissime
Gaisfordi, quicquid est hujus laboris, probare possim. Velle
equidem te meliore aut grandiore dono prosequi! Quæ a nobis
infeliciter tentata, ea tibi explicanda relinquimus. Tu quantum ab
eruditione potes in illis animadvertis, tantum ab æquanimitate
poteris in excusandis. “Tria, quæ in scriptore requiruntur, in
tuis operibus animadverto, doctrinam, diligentiam, candorem:
paucos invenias, in quibus haec tria concurrunt: duo priora in
paucissimis: tertium tanto laudabilius, quanto in hoc ævo rarius.”
Vale.

Thelſordiæ Non. Octobr. M D C C C X V.

“J. Pollux II. 31. Καὶ κομμάτριαι αἱ γυναικεῖ· οἱ δὲ καὶ κεροπλάστας;
αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι κέρας ἡ κόμη: inepte Pollux; scribendum enim
κερατοπλάστας. Κεροπλάστας tamen agnoscit Hesych. (κεροπλάστης:
λεπτουργὸς, ἡ τριχοκοσμητής). Sed vera lectio est κηροπλάστας:
quippe κηρὸς est *fucus muliebris*: hinc κηρίναι, *fæminæ*, quæ faciem
κηρῶ illinunt. Quare κομμάτριαι et κηροπλάσται eadem sunt.
Hesych. Κηρίομα· διμίλημα: leg. κηρίωμα· μιλτωμα: nam μιλτος
est *cerussu*, qua utuntur mulieres: vel pro κηρίωμα fortasse leg.
δμοίωμα.” Toupii Emendd. in Suid. T. iv. p. 963. ed. 1790.

Fallitur Toupius, cum dicit J. Pollucem scribere debuisse κερα-
ποπλάστας pro κεροπλάστας: Οι δὲ καὶ κεροπλάστας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν,
ὅτι κέρας ἡ κόμη. Nam κεραποπλάστας fit per contractionem κερο-
πλάστας. Hesych. Κεροβάτης ὁ Πάν γῆτοι ὅτι κέρατα ἔχει· ἡ οἰονεὶ
Κερατοβάτης, τὴν βάσιν ἔχων κερατίνην. Iterum Hesych. Μελίφυλλον
βοτάνη τις, δὲ καὶ Μελισσόφυλλον, καὶ Πράσιον. “*Melisophyllum* a
Plinio dicitur, unde *melisphyllum* videtur per syncopen a Virgilio
dictum,” Forcellinus in v. E voce ἐπίκοπτον, per contractionem
venit ἐπίκοπον: “Ἐπικόπανον, απὸ ἐπίκοπον dicas, nullum interest dis-
crimen,” T. Hemsteih. ad Luciani Dial. Mort. T. i. p. 371. Sic
κολοβός est per contractionem κόλος, unde fit, ut unum per alterum
exponatur: Hesych. Κόλος· κολοβός.

Fallitur quoque Toupius, cum pro κεροπλάστας ap. Pollucem
scribat κηροπλάστας: J. Pollux l. c. Καὶ κομμάτιαι αἱ γυναικεῖς οἱ
δὲ καὶ κεροπλάστας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι κέρας ἡ κόμη: hic locus sanis-
simus est. Hesych. Κεροπλάστης· τριχοκοσμητής. Plutarch. de
Solent. Animal. p. 976. “Ἐπειτα τὴν ὄρμιαν οὐ ποιοῦσι πολύπλοκον, τοῖς
μημασι τῶν βρόχων, οὐδὲ τραχεῖαν ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ δόλου γίνεται
τεκμήριον αὐτοῖς· καὶ τῶν τριχῶν τὰ καθήκοντα πρὸς τὸ ἄγκιστρον, ὡς
ἔνι μάλιστα λευκὰ φαίνεσθαι μηχανώνται μᾶλλον γάρ εὗτας ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ
δι’ ὀμοιότητα τῆς χρήσις λανθάνουσι· τὸ δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ ποιητοῦ λεγόμενον
‘*II* δὲ μολυβδαλιγίην ἐστι βυσσὸν ὄρουσεν’” *II* τε κατ’ ὄγραμλοιο βοὸς
κέρας ἐμβεβανία “Ἐρχεται ἀμηστῆσιν ἐπ’ ἵχθυσι κῆρα φέρουσα παρα-
κούοντες ἔνιοι βοεῖαι θριξὶν σίονται πρὸς τὰς ὄρμιας χρῆσθαι τοὺς παλαιούς
κέρας γάρ τὴν τρίχα λέγεσθαι καὶ τὸ κείρασθαι διὰ τούτο, καὶ τὴν κευφάνη
καὶ τὸν παρ’ ἀρχιλόχῳ Κηροπλάστην, φιλόκοσμον εἶναι περὶ κόμην καὶ
καλλωπιστήν ἐστι δὲ οὐκ ἀληθές· ιππεῖσις γάρ θριξὶ χρῶνται, τὰς τῶν
ἀρρένων λαμβάνοντες· αἱ γάρ θήλειαι τῷ οὔρῳ τὴν τρίχα βεβρεγμένην
ἀδρανῆ ποιοῦσιν. Cf. Gaisfordii Poet. min. V. i. p. 316., ubi mirum
est doctissimum et accuratissimum virum retinere corruptam vocem
κηροπλάστην, praesertim cum de ea Wyttensbachius scripsisset:
“Immo κεροπλάστη, ut notavit Salmas. et jam antea Jun. T. v.”
Hesych. Κέρας· κεφαλὴ, θρίξ. J. Pollux l. c. καὶ κομμάτιαι αἱ
γυναικεῖς, οἱ δὲ καὶ κεροπλάστας αὐτοὺς ἐκάλεσαν, ὅτι κέρας ἡ κόμη· δὲ καὶ
“Ομηρον δηλοῦν τινες ἔργασαν, εἰπόντα τὸν Πάριν, Κέρ’ ἀγλαόν ὅθεν καὶ
τάρδο Σοφοκλεῖ, Ορθόκερως Φρίκη, οἷον δρόσθριξ, καὶ κέρας βοὸς, τὴν τρίχα.
Hesych. δροκέρως· δρόσθριξ: cf. Phot. Lex. Ms. Hesychius: Κέρα-

κέρατα, τρίχες: Κέρα ἀγλαέ^τ τὴν τρίχα λαμπρέ^τ τῷ τοῦ ἄγαλλόμενε. Schol. Venet. ad II. 1, 383. κέρα ἀγλαέ^τ ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι κέρα, οὐ τῇ τριχῇ ψιλῶς, ἀλλ' ἐμπλοκῆς τι γένος εἰς κέρατος τρόπον ἀνεπλέκοντο οἱ αρχαιοί. Cf. Suid. in v. Iterum, Schol. Venet. B. Σπανιόν ἔστιν ἐπ'^τ ἀνθρωπινῆς φύσεως παρὰ τῷ Ημητῷ τὸ κέρας ἐπὶ τριχῇ; τάσσεσθαι· κέραν δὲ λέγει εἰς τρίχας καὶ πλοκάμους καὶ θείας. Apollon. Lex. Homer. p. 394. ed. Toll. Οἱ μὲν γλωσσογένειοι, ταῖς θρήξιν ἀγαλλόμενε^τ κέρα γάρ, τὴν τρίχα λέγεσθαι· ὁ δὲ Ἀρισταρχος κυρίως ἀκούει τὸ τοῦ βοὸς κέρας, ὃν τὸ κεράτιον, συρίγγιον τὸ γάρ παλαιόν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρώξαι τὸν ιχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιτίθεσθαι τοῦτο· τὸν δὲ "Ομηρον μηδέπετε ειρηκέναι κέρας, τὴν τρίχαν" οὗτον ἐπὶ τοῦ κέρ^τ ἀγλαέ^τ, τῷ τοῦ ἄγαλλόμενε. Iterum p. 196. Βοὸς κέρας (II. Ω. 81.). ὅτοι περικείμενον τῇ ὄρμῃ κέρας ὑπὸ τῷ ἄγκιστρῳ, ἵνα μὴ ἀποτρώγῃ ὁ ιχθύς· ἔτοι δὲ, τὴν τρίχα, κέρας, ubi Villois. "Revera ap. Hesych. τρίχα κέρας: Plutarch. de Sole: t. Animal. post Aristotelem contendit, κέρας significat cornu quod hamo prefigebatur: et Anna Daceria inde quoque factum opinatur, ut κέρας vocaverint pilum bovinum, quod post cornu deinde adhibitus fuerit pilus." Mirum est Villoisorum non vidisse, Plutarchum l. c. ipsissima Aristarchi verba usurpare, ideoque in Plutarcho pro Aristotele legendum esse Aristarchum. Judicet lector. Apollo-nius habet: ὁ δὲ Ἀρισταρχος κυρίως ἀκούει τὸ τοῦ βοὸς κέρας οἷον τὸ κεράτιον, συρίγγιον τὸ γάρ παλαιόν, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἀποτρώξαι τὸν ιχθύν, τῷ ἀγκίστρῳ περιτίθεσθαι τοῦτο. Plutarchus iisdeni fere verbis p. 977.: Ἀριστοτέλης δέ φησι μηδὲν ἐν τούτοις λέγεσθαι σοφὸν ἡ περιττὸν, ἀλλὰ τῷ ὄντι κεράτιον περιτίθεσθαι πρὸ τοῦ ἄγκιστρου περὶ τὴν ὄρμιδην, ἐπειτα πρὸς ἄλλο ἐργάμενοι διεσθίουσιν. Schol. Venet. ad II. Ω. 81. (loc. a Plutarcho supradictum): Βοὸς κέρας· ἡ διπλῆ, ὅτι οὐ λέγει βοὸς κέρας, βοὸς τρίχα, διὰ τὸ τριχινὴν εἶναι τὴν ὄρμιαν λίνας γάρ ἐχράντο. Ἐκ πόντοιο θυράξεις λίνω ἐν τοῖς οἴνοπι χάλκῳ· οἱ δὲ νῦν οὐδὲ βοείσις χρῶνται, ἀλλὰ ἵππείσις λέγοι ἀν οὖν βοὸς κέρας κυρίως κατεσκεύαζον γάρ σύριγγα ἐκ κέρατος βοείου, ἥν παρειθῆσαν τῇ ὄρμιᾳ ὑπὲρ τὸ ἀγκιστρον, ὅπως μὴ οἱ ιχθύς ἀποτρώγωσι τὸν λίνον. Iterum Schol. Venet. B. Κέρας· ὁ προσάπτουσι τῇ ὄρμῃ, πρὸς τὸ μὴ ἐσθίεσθαι καὶ ὁμόχροον εἶναι τῇ θαλάσσῃ· οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι, κέρας, τὴν συμπλοκὴν τῶν τριχῶν. Cf. Plutarchi verba.¹

¹ Lectio κιρταλάστη; Cælio Rhodigino quoque placuit. "Scribunt nonnulli ex grammaticis Græcis, cornua item pro capillis posita inveniri, quoniam

Latini eodem modo *cornua* usurpant. “ Juvenalis de Germano, *Madido torquentis cornua cirro. Cornua vocat longas crinum sertas, quæ torquentur, ut in nodum mitti possint : Græci et ξέρατα appellant : inde et *cornua* et *crines* in fluminibus, τὸ πολυσχιδὲς, et rami.” Salmas. in Solin. p. 535, E. : vide et p. 704, C. “ In galeis *cornua* sunt ornamenta in modum cornū, vel comæ in cornu assurgentēs, quæ cristam apicemque exornant, quæ a Gracis quoque ξέρατα dicuntur : proprie autem sunt *cincinni*. Ita Serv. ad Aen. xii. 89. *Ensemque clypeumque, et rubrae cornua cristæ.* Liv. xxvii. 33. *In arborem illatus impetu equi, ad eminentem ramum cornu alterum galeæ perfregit.*” Forcellinus.*

utraque enascantur modo eodem. Credo, quia ungues, rostra, pili, cornua, plectra, sive calcaria, et si quid ejusmodi aliud est, ex cibo gignuntur aduentio et augendi potestatem habente, quem tum a fœmina, tum forinsecus sibi acquirunt. Ossa vero in prima partium constitutione gignuntur ex seminali excremento, quumque animal augetur, hæc incrementum ex alimento capiunt naturali, quo partes augmentur principales. Adest etymon quoque, cur *cerata* pro *capillis* autument inveniri; inde enim duci videtur nomen, ὅτι συνχωτικά κείπονται, i. e. quod præcidantur assidue. *Ceratoos* et *ceratoglyphos* appellant Græci, qui *cornua expoliunt excoluntque artifici ingenio, ac sculpunt*; sicuti concinnandæ comæ periti, plurimum quidem *comotæ* dicuntur, i. e. κομωταὶ, et *fœmina comotriae*. Sed et *ceroplastæ* vocantur, quoniam (ut præstruximus) *comas* etiam *cerata* vocabant, unde de Paride ap. Homi. κισ' ἀγλαῶν, i. e. *coma illustrem venustumque* interpretantur. Et ap. Sophoclem ὥρθοντες φρίξη, pro eo quod est ὥρθοθριξ, et κισης βοῦς; pro setis intelligunt *bubulis*.” Lectt. antiq. xxx. 1. Hadrianus Junius in Comment. de Coma sic scribit p. 431. “ Quin et κισης veteribus *capillitum* notat, quo sensu κισης ἀγλαῶν Paridem nominat, sed convicio, Homerus, quod ad inescandas et ad stuprum solicitandas virgines *coma lasciviret*; tametsi Herodotus et Appion grammatici in istum Homeri locum annotant, esse quoddam plexus *crinum* genus, instar cornu effigiati, unde illi nomen: variis siquidem modis ornare capillos satagebant majores, quemadmodum plenius dicetur postea: alioqui κισης dixisse illos simpliciter, ostendunt voces κισισθαι, i. e. *tonderi*, et κισης, *tonsura*, quas a κισης derivari vult gravissimus auctor Plutarchus, Archilochus etiam κισηστενη nominante *hominem ornande comæ et componeande studiosum*. Potest et ὥρθοντες φρίξη ex Sophocle hujus rei fidem facere, surrectris pilorum formido.”

AN INQUIRY

*Into the Nature and Efficacy of Imitative Versification,
Ancient and Modern.*

"The best in this kind are but shadows, and the bad are no worse if imagination amend them."

MIDSUM. NIGHT'S DREAM.

No. II.

(Continued from No. XXI. p. 123.)

A good poet or orator should take care to imitate his subject not only by the choice of his words, but by the arrangement of them. This is usually done by the divine Homer, who, although he uses but one metre, and few feet, is yet so abundant in novelty, and so skilful, that it matters not whether we behold or read of the events. Ulysses, in telling his adventures to the Phæcians, and speaking of his descent into hell, affords us a view of its evils and among these relates the sufferings of Sisyphus. It is worth while to see how he represents the attending circumstances by imitation and the very arrangement of the words.

Καὶ μὴν Σίσυφον εἰσεῖδον, κρατέρ' ἀλγε' ἔχοντα,
Λᾶκαν βαστάζοντα πελώδιον ἀμφοτέρησιν.

"Ἔτοι, δὲ μὲν σκηριπτόμενος χερσίν τε ποσίν τε
Λᾶκαν ἄνω ὥδεσκε ποτὶ λόφου.

Od. λ. 592.

I turn'd my eye, and, as I turn'd, survey'd
 A mournful vision, the Sisyphean shade ;
 With many a weary step, and many a groan,
 Up the high hill he leaves a huge round stone.

In these lines the heaviness of the stone, and the labor of moving it, are placed before our eyes by the disposition of the words. We see, also, Sisyphus exerting himself in all his limbs, ascending the hill, and rolling the stone forward with difficulty. The two verses which describe the onward motion of the stone are, with the exception of two words, composed of dissyllables or monosyllables, and the long exceed the short syllables by one half. The flow, also, is sensibly retarded by the collision of the vowels, and the conjunction of the mutes and semi-vowels; and the passage is composed of dactyls and spondees, having the greatest length and most frequent transit.

The tediousness of the work is exhibited by monosyllables and dissyllables, separated by long intervals from each other; difficulty and heaviness by the long syllables; and the interruption arising from the obstacles, and from the greatness of the labor, by the intervals of the words and combination of the harshest letters; the feet considered as to length represent the extension of his limbs, and resistance of the stone.

This is not the spontaneous effect of nature, but arises from art, as appears from the description of the stone's revolution,

ἀλλ' ὅτε μέλλει
·ἰχρον ὑπερβαλλέσθε.

corresponds with what precedes, but is followed by

τότε ἀποστρεψασκε κραταις,
Αὖτις ἐπειτα πέδουνε κυλινθετο λᾶς; ἀναισθε.

Here the collocation of the words rolls down together with the weight of the stone, or rather their swiftness overtakes its descent. The cause of this is, that the verse descriptive of the stone's revolution contains no monosyllable, and only two dissyllables, by which the quantity is not allowed to be prolonged, but is accelerated. Besides, out of seventeen syllables, ten are short, and even the other seven are not perfectly long.¹

The passage which I have omitted is as follows in the original:

There is no hiatus, but all the words seem to be borne along with one common motion. But what is most admirable is, that none of the long feet which may be used in the hexameter, neither spondee, nor bacchius occurs except at the end ; for the others are all dactyls, and are so allied to those which are called undefinable, that some do not differ much from trochees. There is nothing to hinder a diction composed of such feet from being swift, and rounded, and flowing.

Such are the observations of Dionysius, in commenting on which, the character of the author must be considered no less than the nature of his evidence.

If we trace the Grecian history, from the poet downward to the Critic, we shall find that the intervening period is not more remarkable for its length than for the importance of the events and the beauty of the writings which ennobled it.

The battles of Marathon, Salamis, and Platæa ; the successive ascendancy of Athens, Sparta, Thebes, and Macedon ; the conquests of Alexander ; the dissensions of his generals, and the pure but transient lustre of the Achaean league, will remind us that the military genius of Greece had achieved its highest honors, and was verging to extinction ; while the names of the poets, historians, and philosophers, who flourished during that period, will suffice to prove that the powers of the human mind were never more successfully or gloriously exerted. If such were the events, literary and military, of this period, its length was equally remarkable :

“Ανάγκη, οὖν κατεσπάσθαι καὶ συστέλλεσθαι τὴν φράσιν, τῇ βραχύτητι τῶν συλλαβῶν ἐφελκούμενην.

“Ετι πρὸς τούτοις οὐδὲ ὄνομα αὐτὸς ἀνέματος ἀξιόλογον εἴ τρε διάστασιν. οὗτε γὰρ φωνήεντι φωνῆν, οὔτε ἡμιφωνῷ ἡμίζωνον ἢ ἄρων, ἢ τραχύνεν πέψυκε καὶ διιστάνει ἀρμονίας, οὐδὲν ἔστι παρακείμενον.

Notes.—Κατεσπάσθαι, nota hic dissimilitudinem temporum in κατεσπάσθαι καὶ συστέλλεσθαι. *Sylburgius*. Erit quidem eadem temporum dissimilitudo, sed verior fortasse lectio, si quis admittendum censeat κατεσπύσθαι : eo sane utitur Longinus Sect. 39, τῷ τὴν ἀρμονίαν μὴ κατεσπύσθαι : eo quod numerus non præcipitetur. *Upton*.

“Αφωνογίνεται. Forsan, verbo γίνεται in sequentem periodum translato, sic legendus locus: οὔτε ἡμιφωνῷ ἡμιφωνον ἢ ἄρων, ἢ τραχύνεν πέψυκε καὶ διιστάνει τὰς ἁρμονίας, οὐδὲν ἔστι παρακείμενον οὐ δῆ διαστασίς αἰσθητῇ γίνεται μὴ διηρημένων τῶν λέξεων. *Sylburgius*.

Hanc vocem γίνεται e contextu sustuli, plane otiosam, monente etiam Hudsono; cum nec in reg. 1. codice, nec Colb. appareat. *Upton*.

for no chronologist will deny that eight hundred years must have elapsed between the birth of Homer, and that of Dionysius.¹

In other languages, such an interval would have blended, if not identified, the antiquary with the critic; but the language of Homer was unequalled in duration as in excellence, and when Greece finally sunk beneath the arms and policy of Rome, she might still find some consolation in reflecting that her literature survived the ruin of her freedom, and that she retained that superiority in science which she had once possessed in war.

The lapse, therefore, of eight centuries does in no degree disqualify Dionysius for appreciating and illustrating the beauties of his author, although it naturally leads us to inquire if none among the various and unrivalled writers, whom that period comprehended, can be quoted in confirmation of his remarks. We are fully authorized to assert that they could not have been unacquainted with the merits of their national poet; and as we are taught by history and philosophy, that the times which form the soldier and the statesman are more favorable to literature than the enervating quiet of unresisting slavery,² the dweller at Rome can on no account be preferred to the citizens of independent Greece; nor can their silence be compensated by his evidence. Dionysius, however, (unless I am much mistaken) refers to none of the Grecian authors; and though his commentator, Upton, mentions Aristotle and Demetrius Phalereus, we shall derive no assistance from his reference.

The former author certainly says, in his *Poetics*, that if we substitute $\chiράζουσιν$ for $\betaούωσιν$, the effect will be destroyed; but there seems no reason to conclude, from the context, that he means the imitative effect.

The passage referred to by Upton is as follows:

“ Undoubtedly, when these licences appear to be thus *purposely used*, the thing becomes ridiculous. In the employment of *all* the species of *unusual* words, moderation is necessary; for metaphors, foreign words, or any of the others, improperly used, and with a

¹ According to Blair, and the Arundelian marbles, Homer flourished 907, A. C. according to Newton, 870. Dionysius went into Italy, by his own account, in the middle of the 187th Olympiad, A. C. 30.

² Postquam bellatum apud Actium, atque omnem potestatem ad unum conferre pacis interfuit, magna illa ingenia cessere.—Tacitus, Hist. L. 1. C. 1. Gibbon somewhere remarks, that the age of science has generally been the age of military virtue. In our own history, whether the reign of Queen Anne, or, with greater justice, that of Elizabeth, he accounted our Augustan age, we shall find the same union of literary and military talents; nor has the fact been less strikingly exemplified in the present period.

design to be ridiculous, would produce the same effect. But how great a difference is made by a *proper* and temperate use of such words, may be seen in *heroic* verse. Let any one only substitute *common* words in the place of the metaphorical, the foreign, and others of the same kind, and he will be convinced of the truth of what I say. For example: the same Iambic verse occurs in *Aeschylus* and in *Euripides*; but by means of a single alteration—the substitution of a foreign for a common and usual word—one of these verses appears beautiful, the other ordinary.

For *Aeschylus*, in his *Philoctete*, says,

φύγειν τ. ή μου σάσκα; 'ΕΣΘΙΕΙ πολές;

The cankerous wound that *eats* my flesh.

But *Euripides*, instead of *είδει* [eats], uses *ΘΟΙΝΑΤΑΙ*.

The same difference will appear if, in this verse,

Νῦν δέ μ' εἰν 'Ο ΗΠΟΣ τε καὶ ὈΤΤΙΛΑΝΟΣ καὶ ΑΚΙΚΤΣ,
we substitute *common words*, and say

Νῦν δέ μ' ἐὰν μικρός τε καὶ ὀτενικός καὶ ἀειθής.

So, again, should we for the following—

Δίφορον ἀεικέλιον καταβεῖς, ολίγην τε τράπεζαν,
substitute this,

Δίφορον μικρὸν καταβεῖς, μικράν τε τράπεζαν:
or change '*Hίονες βούσαν*'—the cliffs *rebellore*—to '*Hίονες κράζουσιν*'—the cliffs *resound*."

I have only to add, that Twining, whose translation I have used, asserts in his first dissertation, that "of the other two senses in which poetry may be, and by modern writers has been, considered as imitation—*resemblance of sound* and *description*—Aristotle says nothing."

The other passage referred to by Upton occurs in the treatise *περὶ ἔρμηνες*, and is as follows:

OB.

Ἐν δὲ τῷ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ χαρακτήρι σύγκρουσις πάγιον αρβάνιστ' ἀντρίσουσι, ἥτινι οὐκανθρώπῳ, ὡς τῷ, Αἴσαν ἄνω ἀνεσκεῖ καὶ γὰρ ὁ στίχος μῆκος τοῦ ἕσχατον ἐν της συγκρούσεις, καὶ μεμίμηται τοῦ λίθου, τὴν ἀναφορὰν καὶ βίᾳ.

It cannot, therefore, be denied, that the passage is perfectly appropriate; although the authenticity¹ of the treatise may well be doubted. Petrus Victorius attributes it to the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus, on the authority of Theophylactus, who lived 1300 years later. Valesius ascribes it to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, on the authority of the scholiast upon Aristophanes; and dissents from

¹ If the Bishop of Landaff's distinction (Letters to Tom Paine) is correct, I should say *genuneness*.

Victorius, because Artemo (who made an index to Aristotle's Epistles, and lived long after the celebrated Demetrius Nicias, the painter, who was contemporary with King Attalus) and Demetrius himself, are mentioned in it. Gerard Vossius says, that the Epistle of Theophylactus, as Victorius himself confesses, is not to be found in the Florentine manuscript, and thinks that the authority of the Scholiast is not to be preferred to that of Ammonius, who mentions the writer of the treatise by the single name of Demetrius. He concludes, therefore, that it was written by a Demetrius; not by him, however, who was surnamed Phalereus, but by the Alexandrian rhetorician. Gale is of the same opinion, and adds, that, if his own positions are correct, the writer's age cannot be unknown, as the Alexandrian Demetrius was contemporary with Galen and Herodes Atticus; but as Vossius¹ has not fixed his age, he himself does not speak confidently.

Of the two authors, therefore, whom Upton quotes, Aristotle is rather for us than against us; and Demetrius, as in all probability he lived long after Dionysius, will weigh but lightly in the balance.

It is not my business to search for authorities against myself, which have not been noticed by my opponents; and when I say that Demetrius, Eustathius, and Dion Chrysostom,² who flourished under Trajan,¹ or about one hundred years after Dionysius, are the only Greek writers who countenance Dionysius, I make the assertion not from my own knowledge, but from a conviction that they would not have been quoted by Clarke and others, if better testimony could have been procured. Eustathius flourished, according to Blair, in the twelfth century, and consequently more than two thousand years after Homer. It is not my intention to extenuate the merits of him or Demetrius, nor indeed to offer any remark upon their criticisms; for the authority of Dionysius is so superior to theirs, that they can neither invalidate nor substantiate

¹ De Rhet. Nat. Cap. ix.

² Clarke, in his note upon Iliad Δ, 435, refers to "Dio, Orat. XIII." Unless the orations are differently arranged in different editions, XIII is an error of the press, for I at last found the quotation in the XIIth. Ed. Reiske. The whole passage is too long for insertion, but the following part cannot well be omitted.

"Οὐδεὶς εὐόγγειος ἀπεχόμενος, ἀλλὰ ἐν Βραχεῖ ποταμῷ τε μιμούμενος φυνάς, καὶ ὥλης καὶ αὐξίων καὶ περίσσους καὶ θαλάττης· ἔτι δὲ χαλκοῦ καὶ λίθου, καὶ ξυπάντων ἀπλῶς ζών τε καὶ σέργανων, τοῦτο μὲν θηρίων, τοῦτο δὲ δρυΐδων, τοῦτο δὲ αἰλῶν τε καὶ στρυγγῶν· καναχάς τε καὶ βόρβους καὶ κτύπους, καὶ δοῦπους, καὶ ἄραβον πέρωτος ἔβευρων, καὶ οὐομάστας ποταμούς τε μοζμύσοντας καὶ βελη κλάζοντα καὶ βοῶτα κύματα, καὶ χαλεπαινοντας ἀνέμους." Pp. 409, 410.

³ Photius, Cap. ccix "ἵκματε δὲ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τοῦ βασιλέως Τραϊανοῦ."

his assertions by their own, nor can any inference be drawn from their admiration of representative metre as to the opinion of Aristotle or Plato.¹ Should this inquiry attract any notice, I may be enabled to add other names to this meagre list;² but if in the vast range which Grecian literature affords (for we are told that the language was spoken and written with elegance and purity until the downfall of the Eastern empire; and, indeed, it may still, with little impropriety, be called a living language) no witnesses less objectionable can be found, I shall derive no slight encouragement from the circumstance.³

Dionysius is positive and explicit, and has always been held in high estimation. His accuracy, however, as an historian, has been questioned by Hooke; and in some passages of his treatise on composition, he attributes effects so wonderful to causes so incongruous, that we are authorized to suspect his discrimination. The principles of the art, as was mentioned before, are to be sought in the power of single words, and the joint effect of many, in the cadence of verse, and the properties of its feet; and, however skilfully these may be varied and adapted, sound itself can imitate nothing but sound. "Dionysius himself," says Johnson, "tells us, that the sound of Homer's verses sometimes exhibits the idea of corporeal bulk. Is not this a discovery nearly approaching to that of the blind man, who, after long inquiry into the nature of the scarlet color, found that it represented nothing so much as the clangor of a trumpet?"⁴ And again, "Many other instances Dionysius produces; but these will sufficiently show, that either he was fanciful,

¹ Dionysius refers to Plato only as an etymologist.

² The following epigram is written by Cerealius, of whom little or nothing is known.

Οὐ τὸ λέγειν παράγουσα, καὶ Ἀττικὰ βίβλα πέντε,
Εὐγέλως ἐστίν καὶ φρεσίως μελετάν.
Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰ κάρκχιζε, καὶ εἰ, κονιαβεῖ, τὸ τε, σιξεῖ,
Καὶ, κελάργυρε, λεγεις, εὐθὺς Ὁμηρος ἐστιν,
Νοῦς ὑποκειθεὶς δεῖ τοῖς γράμμασι καὶ σφράγισι αὐτῶν
Εἶναι κοινότεραν ὥστε νοεῖν οὐ λέγεις. Vide Iliad, §. 399.

Trypho (vide Museum Criticum, No. 1) in his Remarks Περὶ Ὀνοματοτιτιας, says, πεποιημένον, ὡς τὸ Τετράγύμτα καὶ Κελαργύρει· καὶ Λάθοντες γλωσσητι.

³ It is not unusual, upon any deficiency of evidence, to refer to the Alexandrian grammarians, and to assert that much must have been written, because nothing is extant. With regard to the burning of the Alexandrian library, Gibbon says, "For my own part, I am strongly tempted to deny both the fact and the consequences; the fact is, indeed, marvellous." Whatever these grammarians may have written, it appears that their fame was confined to Alexandria, and that no copy of their works was to be obtained elsewhere.

⁴ Rambler, 94.

or we have lost the genuine pronunciation, for I know not whether in any one of these instances such similitude can be discovered."

Lord Kainies also observes, that, "except in the single case where sound is described, all the examples given by critics of sense being imitated in sound, resolve into resemblance of effects — Emotions raised by sound and signification may have a resemblance; but sound itself cannot have a resemblance to any thing but sound."

If, then, the authorities adduced are insufficient to prove the prevalence of this opinion, the reasoning of Dionysius will hardly remove our scruples, or convince us that the means which versification affords are competent to the alleged effects. In candor, I must add, that Johnson's sentiments are not so favorable as they may seem from the foregoing extracts; for in the 92d number of the Rambler, he says, "It is not, however, to be doubted, that Virgil, who wrote amidst the light of criticism, and who owed much of his success to art and labor, endeavoured among other excellences to exhibit this similitude, nor has he been less happy in this than in the other graces of versification." The nicety and minuteness apparently requisite for imitative harmony countenance the preference which is here given to Virgil; and if we assume, that he did endeavour to exhibit this similitude, and was furnished with adequate means, we cannot doubt of his success. His art and labor are evident and unquestionable; but the source of that light of criticism, which directed them in this instance, is not easily to be ascertained.

I have attempted to show that Dionysius is the earliest writer on this subject, and shall now attempt to show, with still less hopes of succeeding, that Virgil was not enlightened by his criticism. We know that Dionysius came into Italy on the conclusion of the civil war, in the middle of the 187th Olympiad, or about 724 U. C. 30 A. C.; and that when he had lived at Rome twenty-two years, and made himself master of the Latin language and antiquities, he began his work upon the latter.¹ Servius tells us that Virgil wrote the Bucolics when he was twenty-eight years old; and Donatus says, that the Bucolics were written in three, the Georgics in seven, and the *Aeneid* in twelve, years; but as their authority has been thought insufficient to establish these dates, I shall only assume as certain, what, I believe, has not been questioned, that he died in his fifty-second year, A. C. 19. U. C. 735. Now, if it could be proved that the Antiquities were written prior to the treatise on composition, it must follow that Virgil never read the latter work,

¹ Polyphemus, Achilles, Egi.

² Sect. III. Chap. VIII. Elements of Criticism.

³ Antiq. Rom. 1st book, 6th page, Sylb. ed. Photius, 83d Chap.

as he died about eleven years before Dionysius began the former. But, unfortunately, I have not been able to ascertain the date of this treatise, and must consequently confine myself to conjecture.

The fact of Dionysius devoting twenty-two years to the study of a foreign language, and to the collection of materials for a long and laborious work, allows us to infer with much probability that he left Greece before his fortieth, and perhaps soon after his thirtieth year. Now there are some passages in this treatise which savour of age rather than of youth, for he addresses the Rufus, to whom it is inscribed, and whom Lindenbrogius calls his son, in the language of Homer, as his dear son,

λιγόν τοι καὶ ἐγώ. τίκνυ φίλε, τοῦτο θέσμη.

a quotation which presupposes a considerable difference of years between the two persons: Rufus, moreover, had arrived at manhood; Dionysius promises him another treatise if the Gods should preserve his life; and it appears that he was then teaching rhetoric at Rome.³ There is, therefore, presumptive evidence for concluding that this treatise was written in that city, and that the writer was advanced in years.

Since, then, Virgil, as was mentioned before, died A. C. 19, or about eleven years after the arrival of Dionysius, he could not have profited by his criticisms, if these conclusions are valid. There is, however, one reason for supposing that they were written at an earlier period, which must not be omitted.

¹ It was written before De ad. vi die. Dem., as it is twice referred to in that work. Mr. Mitford says, in his note upon the funeral oration of Demosthenes, vol. 8. p. 464: "Dionysius himself, and all other Greeks, and their fathers and grandfathers, had been living under Roman despotism. Possibly his youth might see the last convulsions of the Roman Republic, when it most despotically commanded the civilized world; but no free government was ever within the scope of his conversation." If the extensive reading of Mr. Mitford has not enabled him to speak with confidence upon the age of Dionysius, it is not probable that other authors will succeed in their inquiries.—The following extract from the Quarterly Review (No. 91, April) will suffice to show the slow circulation of the best works before the invention of printing: "Yet more to extenuate his faults, and exalt his beauties, it is right to remember that Petrarch's genius was as strictly individual as that of Dante. In that early age of literature the multiplication of copies was slow and uncertain, and we have the authority of Petrarch himself, that the great work of his immortal predecessor was, to a considerably degree at least, unknown to him until a late period of his poetical career."

² Λε' οὐ παξαγέγονε εἰς αὐτοὺς ἡλικίαν. 4th line.

³ Upton's note upon εὐ ταῖς καὶ φύσεσσι. P. 170, *Typhus καὶ*.

⁴ Henry Stephens' opinion, as far as I can judge from the following extract, which I found in Hudson's edition, is not decisive:

"Eos igitur, qui Dionysii opera critica et rhetorica ante Antiquitatem libros scripta suisse contendunt, (que et mea est sententia) hisce argumentis nini oportet: uno, quod multa que in illis sunt reprehensiones quendam juvenilis ingenii favorem prae se terunt: altero, quod si historiam prius scrip-

Dionysius not only does not quote any parallel passage from Virgil, but makes no allusion whatever to that poet; which seems to prove that he was then unacquainted with the Latin language, and consequently that this treatise was prior to the Antiquities. To this I answer, that his silence was in unison with the conduct of later authors; for Gibbon tells us,¹ "There is not, I believe, from Dionysius to Libanius, a single Greek critic who mentions Virgil or Horace; they seem ignorant that the Romans had any good writers." That they, who called all other nations barbarians, neither loved their conquerors nor prized their literature, may safely be assumed; nor should it excite surprise if the Greeks had known, and yet declined to notice, the merits of Virgil and Horace.

In reading the parallels of Plutarch, we easily discern and pardon the national prejudice of the writer; and few will refuse to allow, that, while the painful consciousness of present humiliation was heightened by the bitter remembrance of past glory, the critics of Greece were unlikely to celebrate the poets of Italy. But with Dionysius the case was widely different, for he devoted a large portion of his life to the illustration of Roman antiquities; and as the *Georgics*² are said to have been finished the very year of his arrival, it is all but impossible that Virgil's fame should be unknown to our critic, and very improbable that he, who was paying his court at Rome, would have purposely neglected to notice the representative metre of that poet, if the Romans were familiar with its beauties, and deemed him in this, as in other respects, the rival of Homer. I, however, who have ventured to deny not only the notoriety, but the existence of representative metre in Homer and Virgil, cannot allow that Dionysius was bound to notice what the countrymen of Virgil overlooked; and shall leave the reader to decide the date of the treatise, while I attempt to invalidate its contents.

As Homer was copied, in a greater or less degree, by all succeeding poets, their practice should afford as clear a demonstration of this art as the criticisms of our author; and if we find corresponding instances in their works, the prevalency of this opinion among them ought not to be disputed. Dionysius says, that poets and historians concur in this practice; but as his quotations are taken from Homer alone, his assertion will not facilitate our inquiries. Upton, indeed, quotes two passages in Apollonius Rhodius, which seem analogous to

sisset, non verisimile quum Thucydidea quedam in eâ imitetur, ex iis etiam quæ imitatus esset, nonnulla postea in ipso Thucydide reprehensurum. Neque tamen interim negaverim fieri et hoc posse, ut ex variis illis rhetoriciis commentariis, aliquem aut etiam aliquos et post impositum historiæ finem scriperit."

¹ 2d chap. 1st vol. Decline and Fall.

² V. Virgili vitam per annos digestam, U. C. 724.

Προποκυλινδόμενος πατρὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,

and are as follows :

ἐπὶ δὲ ἐρρώσαντο πόδεσσιν

Προποβιαζόμενοι· ή δὲ ὅπερ Πηλιὰς Ἀργώ.

Argon. lib. i. v. 385.

and

'*Η δὲ ἄφαρ, ὥστε κύλινδρος, ἐπέτρεψε κύματι λαύρῳ*
Προποκατατίγην κοίλης ἀλός.

Lib. ii. v. 596.

But he adds, “nullus tamen excitatur affectus,” an opinion in which, I believe, all will agree, as the trifling similarity of sound cannot so countervail the striking difference of meaning, as to make the three passages productive of one effect, and referrible to one cause.

The Grecian authors, taken collectively, will doubtless furnish many instances, in which a faint, or perhaps a strong, resemblance may be discoverable; but this will hardly be sufficient, for, as the imitation of Homer is evident and undeniable in other cases, so are we entitled to expect, that the adaptation of the sound to the sense shall be clearly visible; and that the nicety and artifice of that adaptation shall evince the skill as well as the intention of the artist. In short, there must be here, as in other imitations of Homer, not only the use, but the abuse of art; success and failure, propriety and impropriety, moderation and extravagance, must be found in all their various forms before it can be justly asserted, that the practice of Greece was in harmony with the declarations of Dionysius.

The tragedians' and lyrists enjoyed a license which was denied to the epic poet. Let us seek, therefore, in their pages for the necessary proofs, and if our search is unsuccessful, let us not conclude that they were unable to bend the bow of Homer, but rather that our critic was not warranted in his assertions. We learn, also, from a note of Twining, that Homer was the great and inexhaustible resource of the parodists; let us, then, enquire whether there is any reason for believing that they availed themselves of means, the agency of which is said to be so powerful, and which are certainly capable of general application. If our search is again fruitless, let us turn to the Latin authors, and examine the practice of Virgil, and the opinions of his countrymen. K.

¹ I believe no one attributes the repetition of σ in
“Εσωσά σ’, αἱστασιν Ἑλλήνων ὕστοι
to a “consulta verborum κακοφωνία.”

Κακοφωνία, according to the Scholiast on Hephæstion, (p. 184.) by no means implies harshness.

Κακοφωνίας δέ ἔστιν ὡς πολλὰ φωνήεντα πρίσεστιν· οἷον,

Φῆγος αἴγρηγλοιλαιγόν ἔχειν· ἀνὰ φαιδμῷ ὥμω. (Od. λ. 127.)

The “*Non, il n'est rien que Nanine n'honore*” of Voltaire is well known.
See *Class. Journ.* Vol. ix. p. 589.

D. HEINSH ORATIO
DE UTILITATE, QUÆ E LECTIONE TRAGEDIARUM
PERCIPITUR.

In our 17th No. p. 9. we, by the advice of a friendly correspondent, republished "Boxhornii Oratio de Constitutione Tragediarum, et Sapientia civilis, atque Eloquens ex eorum Lectione haurienda;" and by the advice of the same writer, we present to our readers an Oration of D. Heinsius, taken from "D. Heinsii Orationum Editio nova," published at Amsterdam, 1657, 12mo.

*Oratio de Utilitate, qua i Lectione Tragediarum percipitur, Habita,
cum Electram Sophoclis interpretaturus esse!*

GOERIAS ille Leontinus, Auditores, cui vires suas et rotunditatem quandam in dicendo antiqui oratores se debere fatentur, Tragediam definiebat, *Fallaciam, qua qui deciperet, justior eo qui non deciperet, qui deciperetur, sapientior eo qui non deciperetur, esset.* Videlis breve illud et argutum, quo tantopere delectabatur, disserendi genus. Ora-
colum autem verius, nec ille, nec Apollo Delphiens, pronuntiavit un-
quam. Nam cum aspera minusque amena sit virtutis via, qui inus-
tata quadam ac insolita docendi ratione et apparatu, ita flectere, et
quasi incantare, humanos possunt animos, ut inviti, et cum voluptate
tamen quadam, sapientiam sequantur, quemadmodum prudenter, ita
juste infelicitati humane imponunt, neque minus nece seria quam sa-
luti quadam fraude utuntur. Ceterum à tantis viris pesse decipi,
paucorum est: et illorum frē tantum, qui praestantiam eorum, si non
assequi re ipsa, mente ac intellectu estimare ac complecti possunt,
qui cum aliquo judicio decipiuntur. Profecto equidem, quoties the-
atri veteris ornatum, quoties stupendam illum opulentiam ac appar-
atum, illos modos, gestus, cantus et saltationes, que extrinsecus adhi-
bebantur, (que spectaculorum instrumenta Aristoteles praelare dixit)
recte considero: beneficia quoddam et doctissimas præstigiis fuisse
Tragediam judico: quibus multo efficacius quam legibus Soienis sui,
ad representationes Tragicas pertrahentur isti. Contra autem ipsum
Sophoclem in manus quotidie cum sumo, cum severam illam, gravem,
sobriam, prudentem, castigatam, splendidam, semperque sui similem
orationis formam, vere Atticam, sententiarum autem vel imprimitis
densitatem estimare incipio ac pondus; non tam bonitatem profecto,
quam celestem aliquem virtutis genium, audire video: qui inferiora
hæc, in quibus voluntatur, nunquam pede, his sordibus contaminatus,
presserit, sed in alto aliquo et publico theatro, vitæ nostræ clades ac
calamitates observarit ac despicerit, ibi natus, ibi educatus, uni huic
rei semper fuerit intentus. Cujus spectatores, non Athenienses, sed
humanum genus esse oporteat: quique linguae sue gnos, Occidentem
periter atque Orientem habuisse mereatur. Neque enim, quæ ad uni-

versam vitam, quæ ad universos spectant homines, quæque tam divina ac severa gravitate, castitate ac prudentia, de omnibus dicuntur, tam angustis contineri debuisse finibus existimo, quæ ut penitus examinare, neque nostri nunc est osii neque instituti, ut qui lingue venustatem, mores ac antiquitates explicandas obiter atque illustrandas nunc suscepimus, ita nefas duco, in minutis sic hæcere, ut ad illa quæ majora sunt, neque unum nec oculos subinde attollamus. Nam ut magnam ac præstantem regiam, plures si videant, ut singuli sententiam de ea ferant, tabulas in ea pictor, mulos, lacunaria, ac topiaria, peritus horum aestimabit, cetera geometra, qui de proportione judicare solent, melius videbunt: ita cum in Sophocle, Grammaticus, Poëta, ac Rhetor, singuli virtutes suas invenerint, plus Philosophis relinquunt. Non de Dialecticis jam loquor: qui acute disputare quam prudenter malunt vivere. Neque Physicos intelligo: in primis eos qui in aere, in terra superficie aut penetralibus cum vivant, domi et in terris peregrini sunt, non cives. Sed de parte hac, quæ reliquarum imperatrix dicitur ab Aristotele, quæ et singulos, ut homines, et omnes, tanquam cives, quid sit sui muneris in urbe, docet, et quod longe est præcipuum, sortem ac conditionem hominum vere ac concione ob oculos lectori ponit. Quid est homo? umbre somnum, si quaeras, respondebit Pandarus. Quid est homo? simulacrum quoddam, dicet Sophocles. Quid est homo? ipsa calamitas, ut loquitur Herodotus. Quid est homo? occasio miseriarum, ut Philemon loquitur. Quid est homo? folium caducum, ut Homerius loquitur. Quid est homo? exemplum imbecillitatis, temporis spolium, lusus fortunæ, mutationis imago, invidie et calamitatis trutina; præter illa, nihil, nisi pituita aliquantulum et bilis, docet, et jam olim dixit Aristoteles. Hoc sive animal, seu monstrum potius, cuius orbis quantus quantus est ambitionem ac luci stadium non capit, fletu spectatorem in lucem editus salutat, neque oratione, sed lacrymis ac fletu primas partes agit, quam in spem ac felicitatem à natura porro educatur. Prologum videtis: mutum hercules omnino, nisi quatenus vagire solet, unde et infantem haud immerito Latinum, r̄ijtor dixerunt Græci. Donec tandem fari sensim, et interpretatione linguae, miseram conditionem suam, nondum quidem explicare (nam quis satis eam novit?); sed fateri tamen incipit. Ita ad magistros alegatur, quorum scilicet ac virgos patientiam indulget: sæpe truculentis, srpe barbaris, nam et hic Ajæcs sunt qui flagræ gestant, non in scena tautum. Interim rem agi credas. Literarum nexus atque syllabarum, mox verborum, discunt. Addo et, ut magno postea labore disciplinas discant, prius cum maiore in linguis diu versantur, atque hic sane Protasis, quæ prima pars Tragœdiæ, ponatur. Sequitur secunda, plane ut in Tragœdia videmus: in qua turbæ aliae ex aliis nascuntur. Plerique enim, simul atque ad pubertatem est deuentum, quasi non virorum sit ubique satis quibus, otium ac libertatem suam mancipare possint, inservire fœminis incipiunt: quæ his moribus ac corruptela, ab aetatis anno decimo et quanto, dominæ vocantur, plane id quod sunt, ac optimo cum jure; non impriosæ modo, sed procaces quoque nostro vitio ac insolentes. Ibi jam desidiose ætas agitur ac misere. Obsidendiæ fore, salutandi multi, plures me-

**tuendi : ancillarum quoque nutus ac servorum, diligenter observandi
iis qui ad dominas affectant viam.** Adde, quod plerunque quæ amari
nostro vitio se didicit ac intellexit, non minores à calamitate nostra,
quam ab opibus aut forma sua spiritus assumit.

*At lachrymans exclusus amator, limina saepe
Floribus et sertis operit : postaque superhos
Ungut amuracino, et foribus miser oscula figit.*

quodque magis admireris, ex his vere Comicis, ineptiis miseriisque, optima Tragoediarum nascuntur argumenta. Defunctos isto malo, domi malum saepe gravius, foris innumera excipiunt. Quippe hic militis, iste mercatoris, alius agricolæ, alius causidici personam agit. quisque ita suam, ut felicem alienam existimet : fastidiosi histriones, et cum aliis molesti, tum sibi. Porro si quis altiora struit, et ambitioni pedem laxat, inter spes et vota rem cuin cura gerit: id est, vigilando somniet, vel dum non consequitur quæ optat, vel quod consecutus magna, ideo majora jam sperare audet. Ille filii obitum deplorat: iste, sed cum lachrynis, moleste optat. Huic domi est Medea, non ad horam, ut in scena, sed ad vitam comes. Illum fortuna nunquam melior respexit: illum diu, sed hac lege, ut subito relinquat; interdum et ludibrio exponat. nam cum aliqui se semper miseros fuisse clament, longe tamen est miserrimus qui semper felix fuit. Hinc suspiria, hinc lachrymae, hinc luctus, hinc Tragediae infelix illud condimentum, heu heu! quod in vita paginam utramque facit. Jam si ad Ajaces nostros et OEdipodas eamus; propria eorum ut in scena, ita et in vita est calamitas, qui quot satellitibus, tot curis, tot molestiis atipantur, neque cadunt ut resurgent, sed ut semper jaceant ac deprimentur. Sicut enim minima animalcula è loco vel altissimo, impune cadunt, majora casus quilibet communuit et frangit: ita sceptræ ac fasces, opes ac potentiae, et inania ista rerum, ut stantibus dignitatem addunt, ita lapsos pondere ipso premunt et comminuunt. Partem ultimam, ut in Tragœdia, ita raro invenias in vita. Quotusquisque enim senectutem attingit? quæ et hic Catastrophe vocari meretur. ultima quippe etas, officina luctus, portus vitae simul et calamitatum mare est. quam ut omnes optant, ita nemo consecutus, ea gaudet: optima cum expectatur, cum advenit, onerosa sibi, aliis molesta. Instat enim diu viventibus natura. quæ, ut creditor immis, aut danista importunus, jus suum sibi flagitat. Itaque, si nimium cuncteris, huic oculum, illi dentem, illi sensum aliquem, aut omnes simul, tanquam pignus, eripit ac tollit. ut qui modo omnia excelsa spirat, jam imago sui aut cadaver vivum inter homines oberret. Quanquam fabulam ut plurimum mors ipsa, rerum linea ac finis ultimus, absolvit: cuius machinæ, ut olim histriones loquebantur, plurimæ. Quosdam enim ferrum, quosdam mare, alios libido propria absunit: plerosque nihil tale cogitantes, quasi è postscenio, invadit, ut non vitam modo, sed et spes in medio abrumpat. Plenam suis partibus Tragœdiam habetis: cuius Deus est choragus; argumentum, luctus ac calamitas; histriones, miseri mortales; chorus, feminæ et viri; apparatus, aurum et argentum, vestes varie et magno precio conductæ: aliena omnia ac mutuata,

sæpe autem subito reddenda. Theatrum est hic orbis, in quo hominem natura collocavit. qui, si nos respicias, diffusus; si hanc terram, quaqua panditur, angustus; si immensum illud cœlum, quod hanc ambit undique et involvit, puncti instar est. quem cum magnus Alexander integrum vicisset, paulo post sex pedes occupavit. Reliqua discordiis ac ferro hæredes divisere. cum ex iis nemo esset, qui tam amplum possidere patrimonium ex asse posset. quod si aliquis despiceret è cœlo, forte quereret, nec inveniret. Ite nunc, à histriones nostri, ite, et personam suam quisque agat, ut videtur. Tu qui purpuram et sceptrum geris, quem cum multi cingant, plures timent, nemo non extinctum vellet, orbem animo invade: spes tuas et insaniam votorum, quantum lubet ac videtur, erige aut extende: aliquid humana sorte majus concipe animo ac volve: hostem magno animo invade: militem conscribe: aciem dispone: montes maximos complana: latifundia et turres præstina ac cole. sed, à noster, finis instat, et jam vela scenæ complicantur. Tu, cui opes contigerunt, speciosum illud, si videtur, lutum, quod choragi munere ad tempus accepisti, oculis et mente, quantum potes, contemplare: hujus gratia, dñni vivis, curre, rape, suda, ara, naviga, ac vigila: causas in judicio ac foro, quantum voce vales et lateribus, declama: orbos ac pupillos circumscrive, vi-duas emunge: huic denique inservi, et divinam anime cœlestis partem, ipsam, inquam, rationem, rei quæ nec sentit nec intelligit, submitte, huic penitus inhære. aut, ne tange quidem, si hoc placet: (et quis multis hoc placere neget?) sed in terra alibi depone, securitus ipse. Finis quippe instat fabulæ, quam agis: et jam ornamenta flagitat qui dedit. Dedit, dico? imo mutuavit. Brevem, ut novistis, ambitum Tragœdiae, ac strictum, Rex philosophorum ponit. noster, si æternitatem spectes, nullus dici potest. nullum enim spatium aut intervallum habet. omnia momento hic geruntur. Quod infantiam ac senectutem vulgo vocant, et hoc ipsum quo hæc dividuntur spatium, aut potius momentum, anni Platonici vix hora est. Ex quo ipso somnus, tanquam publicanus quidam, maximum vectigal sibi petit; mortis fidejussor quidam, et quasi anteambulo. qui quotidie nos docet id, quod aliquando semper est futurum. Hæc inculcant Tragici, hæc monent: hæc exemplis, hæc sententiis confirmant. Hæc in Academia eadem tempestate Socrates, qua in theatro publice Euripides, docebat. sed sublimius utroque Sophocles, plerumque et efficacius, ut qui in Republica personam egit, dux Atheniensium et prætor. Vere ubique magnus: domi imperator pariter et foris. Hæc doctrina primum animis cum cura infingenda est: reliqua deinde et secundo loco. Quod in posterum facturi sumus. Multum enim didicit, qui sortem suam ac conditionem intellexit, qui personam bene, et ut brevi aliud acturus, hic sustinuit: qui ex decoro genuit ac luxit. nisi quod hic vero genitu ac ejulatu opus est. Nam ut omnium Philosophorum scripta evolvatis, neminem prudentius scripsisse judicabis quam Heraclitus levit.

IN CARMINA EPODICA AESCHYLEA
COMMENTARIUS.
AUCTORE G. B.

No. II. [Vid. No. XXII. p. 242.]

PERGO ad Agamemnona, nobilem illam tragœdiām, et simul tot et tantis mendis depravatam, ut Viri Doctissimi vix decem versus continuos intelligere queant. Minime igitur mirari debet lector, si quis, metra et sententiām proficiens, paulo liberius se gerat, in volgata scriptura pro libitu mutanda. Nonnunquam tamen illa audacia non modo non veniam sibi poseit, sed potius laudem arrebat, dum locis plane desperatis remedium assert. Exemplum habe ex Epodo ad fabulae initium. Sic enim lego v. 110 et sqq.

Τίσον περ εὗρων Εύκλια
δρόσοις ἀπτυστιν λέοντ-
ων μαλεγῶν πάντων τ' ἄγρουνόμων φύλαμάστεις
θησῶν ὀβρικάλοις, στρουθῶν λύτρον ἀπαιτεῖ
ξυμβολα κράναι ρέεισ
μὲν, κατάμυρφα οἱ φάσματ', Ι-
ήϊ, ἀνακαλ-
ῶσὲ, Ηλιαν,
μή τινας ἀντιπνίους Δανα-
οῖς χρονίας ἵχεινδας;
ἀπλοις;
τεῦχη τις,
σπειρόμενος θυ. ιαν ἀνέγετον ἀ-
δαιτον, νεκέων τέκτον, ασύρχυτον
οὐδὲ εὐήνορα μίμνει γάρ φοβερὰ παλίνορσον
εἰκόνομος δολία μνάμων μῆνις τεκνίποινος;
τοίσθις Κάλχας ἐνὶ μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀπέκλαγξεν
μόρσιμ', ἀπ' ὄφιδαν ὑσίων, οἷκοις βασιλείοις.

V. 1. Ald. ἄρρεν καλά. Victor. οὐφεντις ἀ καλά : ubi mendam alteram sustulit, alteram prætermisit. Dedi Εὔκλια. Sæpe etenim permuntantur **α** et **ι**. In Troas. 977. Ald. οὐλύνας. MSS. Αθηνα. In Choeph. 303. Ald. οὐδέξ Rob. ἀδέξ. Diana nomen Εὔκλια servatur a Schol. in Soph. ΟΕδ. Τ. 161. probante Elmsleio, et, post Brunckium, allegante Plutarch. Aristid. p. 331. E. unde corrigit VV. DD. gl. Hesychii Εύλακις, Αρτιμις. V. 4. Vulgo ὀβρικάλοις τερπτὰ τούτων : mox post φάσματα sequebatur στρουθῶν : e qua voce in sedem propriam reposita patet τούτων nasci e corrupta gl. αἴτων : etenim Scholiastes habet Στρουθῶν, αἴτων. Deinde e τερπτὰ erui λύτρον απ. Nempe Diana ab aquilis (i. e. Atridis) pœnam reposcit. Vox λύτρος in λύγεος corrumphi-

tur in Choeph. 46. ut monuit Canterus; qui rectius legere poterat
 Τι γὰς πτούστος λύτρος αἴματος πίδη. V. 5. Post δέκα μήνα subaudi ἦμιν et
 τοῖς ιγγεοῖς post κατόμεμφα. V. 7. Ex Ἰησοῦ δὲ καλῶ παιᾶνα erui Ἰητὸν
 καλῶ στι παιᾶν. Cf. CEd. T. 15k. Ἰητὸν Δῆλον πειάν. Perpetuum est ver-
 bum ἀνακλων precor. Vid. Indic. Beck. V. 12. Redde νῦξ faciat :
 mox τι excidit ob στ. Et sane in sententiis ambiguis optime locum
 habet illud τις : cf. supr. τις ; et Iph. T. 522. 548. Ion. 1311. Antig. 762. Aj. 1123. S. C. Th. 108. De τις corrupto vel omissio vide
 Porson Hee. 1169. V. 13. Ita Ald. pro σπινδαμίᾳ. Mox vulgo θυ-
 σας ἄργες τις ἀδείτος : unde erui θυσιας αἰρότος ἀδείτος. gl. est
 ἄργες. Exstat ἄργες in Eurip. Electr. 310. ubi MS. ἄργοτος. Simi-
 lis tere error hic peperit ἄργε. V. 14. Vulgo τίκτοντα σύμφυτον. Nec
 nemo intellexit, neque intelligere potuit. Ex Hesychio hausit ἀσύγχυ-
 τος. quod exponit Lexicon ἄπικτος ἥγους μὴ συγχίνεσσον. Nempe ludit
 Aeschylus in voce ἀσύγχυτος: quæ de vino dicta sonat non miscenda,
 de inimicitia vero non placanda: eadem scilicet metaphoram usur-
 pant Graeci in phrasi ἀστιστος vel ἀστορδος iγγε. De qua locutione
 adiutor loca congesta Schaefer ad Dionys. de Composit. Verb. p. 38. et
 Lobeck ad Soph. Aj. 891. qui legendi in Agam. 1214. ἀστορδος τ' Ἀγρ
 Φιδοις πύροις conjecturam Butlero prætrivit, et mihi locum satis ap-
 partum indicavit, quo mea quoque emendatio defendi possit: ibi enim
 Clytaemestra dicitur πνῖσσας ἀστορδος ἄργη φίλοις, hic vero Iphigenia
 mors dicunt esse futura origo μηνίας ἀσυγχύτων i. e. ἀστοιδων. Potuit
 quoque Aeschylus, usurpata voce ἀσύγχυτος, respicere ad metaphoram,
 quam in v. intr. 322. adhibuit de oleo et acetio non facile miscendis.
 Orest. 300. οὐτε πάρετον ἐν πάκητι πεπίπτειν. "Οὐδε τ' ἀλευθότι τ' ἵγχεις ταῦτα κύτει
 Διηγεττοῦτο. τι αὐτὸν φέλεις περιστινεῖν. V. 15. Al. οὐδὲ σινόρει, vero
 proxime. Reposat οὐδὲ σινόρει. Noster enim de sacrificio locutus ad
 Homericum αὐτος: ouer respiciebat: ita tamen vocis etymologiam,
 scilicet σύ βον et ἄργε μαρτιος, in animo habebat, ut oraculi sensum
 ambiguum servaret.

Ibid. 177. et seqq.

Πυρὸς δ' ὅπ' εἶχε, εἰλη
 πόλιν ἐγέκει θύε
 βάζεις· εἰ δέ ἐτήτυμον, τις
 οἶσσεν, οὐτὶ μέντος ἔστι. οὐ
 κακὸν τις ἀδει ταῖσις
 οὐ δρεγμὸς πειλατέος. φέλογ-
 ος πασαγγελιατι. οὐ-
 οις πτερωθεῖστα κερσί-
 αι ἐπειτι
 ἀλλαγὴ

λογγον καρπον;
 γυναικός αἷχν-
 η πρέπει προς τού φανέντ-
 ος χάριν ξυστισθει
 πιθανος αἷχν
 ἐπιβιστη
 ο θύλως θύρα;
 ταχιντης, αλις
 ταχινιδην γυναικοκήρ-
 10 ουκτον οὐλυται κλισ.

V. 6. Vice κεκλεμένος reposui κεκλεμένος. Eadem vox restituenda
 est Theognidi v. 223. Κείον γρ' ἀφεντὶ ἴστι τοὺς κεκλεμένος ισθλού. vulgo
 βιβλαμένος. V. 8. πτερωθεῖστα est conjectura probabilis Blomfieldi in
 Edinb. Rev. No. 38. p. 498. qui tamen lectionem suam cæmplis
 non munivit. At conterre poterat Orest. 874. ἄγγειλμ' ἀππτίσαν—

Suppl. 89. Φίθος μ' ἀπεπτιροῦ. Antig. 1307. ἀνίπταν φίθω. Aristoph. Av. 1453. Ἀπεπτιροῦσα καὶ πικοτῆσα τὰς φένες. At longe aptissimus esset Agam. 1531. Ἀμηχαῖο φρεστίδαν στρεψεις modo probata fuisset conjectura Wakefieldi legentis πτηγωθεῖς in Silv. Crit. I. s. xxv. p. 47. ubi plura in hanc rem reperiet lector studiosus. V. 12. Vice αἰχμῆς reposui ἄχνα: qua voce significatur quicquid est ponderis nullius nempe *palea, spuma maris, sumus, scintilla, lini flos* (Anglice *flew vel fluff*.) Hic vero de mulierum levitate potest intelligi. V. 17. "Ορες non satis capio. Restitui ὄμοις. Hesych. "Ορεοι—μῦθοι, λόγοι.

Accedo ad tres Epodicos cantus, quam maxime depravatos. Burneius quidem in Tentamine de Metris Aeschyleis eos inter systemata Antispastica recenset. At, ni fallor, a vero aberravit, dum metri causa unumquodque systema post singulam Stropham et singulam Antistropham iteratum esse voluit. Alia mihi carminis esse ratio videtur. Quod quum nemo intellexerit, neque potuerit intelligere nisi versibus trajectis et verbis aliquantisper mutatis, totum cantum ad meam mentem emendatum exscribere libet.

Ibid. 1457. &c.

XO. Ἰω ἵω
παρδ νόμους
Ἐλένα μία τὰς πάνυ πολλὰς
Ψυχᾶς ὄλεσσας ὑπὸ Τροίας

Ηζοωδός.

HMX. α'. φεῦ τίς ἀν ἐν τάχει
μὴ περιώδυνος
μηδὲ δεμνιοτή-
ρης μόλοι τὸν αἱεὶ φέρουσ' ἡμῖν
μοῖρ' ἀτέλεστον ὕπνον, δαμεντ-
ος φύλακος εὔμενεστάτου
καὶ πολλὰ τλάντος γυναικὸς διὰ,
πρὸς γυναικὸς δ' ἀπέρθισεν. 11
Κ.1. μηδὲν θανάτου μοιγαν ἐπεύχου,

τοῖσθε βαρυνθεῖς.
μῆδ' εἰς Ἐλένην κότον ἔκτρέψης,
οὐς ἀνδρολότειρ' ως μία πολλῶν 15
Τρφῶν ψυχᾶς Δαναῶν τ' ὄλεσσας'
ἀρκύστατον ἀλγος ἐπεράξε.

XO. νῦν δὲ τελεία πολύμν-
αστος ἀκήνθισε δι' αἵμη-
δνιπτον, ητις ἦν
τότ' ἐν δόμοις, ἔρις,
ἔρις ἀδάματος
ἄρνος, οἰζὺς.

ἀντιστρ. α'.

HMX. β'. δαῖμον, δις ἐμπίτνεις δώ-
μασι καὶ διρυ-
εῖσι Τανταλίδαιο-
ιν, κράτος γυναικῶν ισόψυχον 20
καρδιοδηκτον ἐμοὶ κρατύ-
οις: ἐπὶ δὲ σῶμά τις, δίκαν
τοῦ κόρακος, ἐχθρὸν σταθεὶς ἐκνύ-
μως
ύμνον ὑμνεῖν ἐπεύχεται.
Κ.1. νῦν δ' ὄρθωσας στόματος;
γλῶσσαν, 25
τὸν περίλιχνον
δαίμονα γεννᾶς τῆσδε κικλήσσειν.
ἐκ του γὰρ ἀράς αἰματόλειχος
μοῖρ' ἔκτρέφεται· πρὶν κατέληξεν
τὸ παλαιὸν ἄχος, νεος ἰχώρ. 30

ἐπωδός α'.

35

στρ. β.

HMX. α'. Ἡ μέγαν οίκοις τοῖσδε
δαιμόνα καὶ βαρύμηνιν αἰ-
τεῖς, φεῦ, φεῦ, κακὸν αἰνον ἀτη-
ρᾶς τύχας ἀκορέστου· 40

ιαὶ ιὰ δύσι Διός

παναιτίου πανεργύτα·

τί δὲ βροτοῖς ἄνευ

Διός τελεῖται; τί τῶνδ'

οὐ θεόκρατον ἔστιν; 45

K.1. αὔχει τ' εἶγαι τόδε τούργον
ἔμδν,

μῆτ' ἐπιλέχθης

Ἄγαμεμνονίαν κτεῖναι σφ' ἄλοχον
φανταξόμενος δὲ γυναικὶ νεκροῦ

τοῦδ' ὁ παλχιός δριμὺς ἀλάστωρ 50

Ἄτρεως χαλεποῦ θαινατῆρος

τοῦδ' ἀπετίσεν,

τέλεον γ' ἄργ' ᾧς ἐπιθύσας.

XO. Βασιλεῦ βασιλέων πῶς σε δακρύσω 65
έπι

φρενὸς ἐκ φιλίας; τί ποτ' εἴπω σοι;

κεῖσαι οὐ ἀράχνης ἐν ὑφάσματι τῷδ',

οὐδάμ' ἐλευθέρου οἵμοι θανάτου,

βίον ἔκπνέων

ἀσεβεῖ πότμω,

οἵμοι κοιτάν

τάνδ' ἀνελευθερῶν,

κιαρῶ δολίω δαμεῖς ἐκ

χερῶς ἀμφιτόμῳ βελέμνω. 80

στροφὴ γ'.

HMX. α'. ἀμηχανῶ, φροντίδων

· στεργῆτεις,

ἀπάλαμπος μεριμνᾶν, ὅπα τράπω-

μαι, πίτυστος οἴκου δέδοικα δῆμβρ-

οι κτύπου

δομοσφαλῆ τὸν αἴμα-

τηρόν· φεκάς κέκληγε.

δίκην δ' ἐπ' ἄλλο πρᾶγμα

θήγει βλάβης πρὸς ἄλλαις

θηγάναισι μοῖρα.

XO. ὦ γαῖ, εἴτ' ἐμ' ὁδέξω, πρὶν

ἰδεῖν "

ἀσγυροτοίχου δροίτας 90

ἀντιστρ. β'.

HMX. β'. οὓς μὲν ἀναίτιος ἥσθα

τοῦδε φόνου, τίς ὁ μαρτυρή- 55

σων; πῶς τῶν πατρόθεν γε συλλήπ-

τωρ γένοιτ' ἀν ἀλαστῷρ;

λιάζεται δὲ ὁμοσπόροις

ἐπιρροαῖσιν αἰμάτων

μέλας Ἀρης ὁ παῖς 60

σὲ γάρ, προβαίνω λάχνα,

κηρὶ θοραν παρέξει.

K.1. ὡδε γάρ οὗτος δολίαν ἀτην

οίκοισιν ἔθηκ·

ἀλλ', ἐμὸν ἐκ τοῦδ' ἔριος ἀερθὲν, 65

τὴν πολύκλαυτον ἀνάξια δράσας

ἀξία πάσχων, μηδάμ' ἐν "Αἰδου

μογαλαυχείτω· Εἰφοδηλήτῳ

τῷδε γενέσθω

θανάτῳ τίσαι, τάπερ ἤρξεν. 70

ἀντιστρ. γ'.

HMX. β'. ὄνειδος ἥκει τόδ' ἀντ'

ὄνειδους·

δύσμαχα δὲ ἐστὶ κρῖναι· "Φθεγκί

φθέροντ", 100

ἐκτίνει δὲ ὁ καίγων."

μένει θέμις δόντος ἐν

χρόνῳ Διὸς παθεῖν τὸν

ἔρεατα· θέσμιον γάρ

τίς ἀν γονάν ρῆσν δόμ-

ων ἐκβάλλει; κεκόλλη-

ται γένος πρὸς ὄψιν.

K.1. οὐ σε προσήκει τὸ μέλημα

λέγειν

τοῦτο· πρὸς ἡμῶν καππεσσε

τὸν κατέχοντα χαμεύναν.	κάτθηνε καὶ καταθάψομεν	110
τίς ὁ θάψων νιν; τίς ὁ θρηνόσων;	οὐχ ὑπὲ κλαυθμῶν τῶν ἐξ οἰκου,	
ἢ σὺ τόδ' ἔφεξαι τλῆσει κτείνασ'	ἀλλ' Ἰφιγένειά νιν ἀσπασίως	
ἄνδρα τὸν αὐτῆς,	θυγάτηρ, ὡς χρῆ,	
ἀποκάκωσται ψυχὴν, ἄχαριν	πατέρ' ἀντιάσασα πρὸς ὠκύπορον	
χάριν ἄντ' ἔργων	πόρθμευμ' ἀχέων	
μεγάλων ἀδίκων ἐπικράναι;	περὶ χειρὸς βάλοῦσα φιλήσει.	

XO. πᾶς δὲ ἐπιτύμβιον	ἐπιτύμβιος γ'
αῖνον ἐπὶ ἄνδρι θεί-	
ω ἔντονος ὀπερώνοις ἴ-	
ἀλλων ἐν ἀληθεί-	
ᾳ φρενών ἡρῆ-	120
νον ποιήσει.	

V. 3. Vulgo *mīa tās πολλās tās πάνιν πολλάς*. Voces repetitas rejici. V. 7. *is iūnī*. Burneius delet *is*. V. 8. *ἀτέλιντον* analogiæ oppugnat. Emendavi *ἀτέλιστον* in Append. Troad. p. 135. A. V. 11. *βιον* delendum jussit Hermannus. *Φίων* est verbum intransitivum. In Soph. Trach. 1043. corrige *ινάσαν* ἀκυρίτην μόρῳ τὸν μίδεον φάσας. vice *φίων*. V. 16. Vice *ἄνδεων* quod abundat post *ἄνδεολίτιερα* reposui *Τέραν*. Cf. Virgil. Aen. ii. 573. *Troja et patriæ communis Erinnys*. Scil. *Helena*. Cf. et Eurip. Helen. 389. *τὸ δὲ ίμ' θίμας ἀλεῖται Δαρεῖαν' ἐλοι-* *ρεις* & *Ἀχαιούς*. V. 17. Vulgo *ἀκύνστατον*. quod nemo intellexit. Dedi *ἀκύνστατον*: cf. supr. 1377. *πημόνη* *ἀκύνστατον*. V. 22. Non bene *Græcum iiri σώματος—σταθί*. Legi potuit *ἀπό*: Vid. Musgrav. ad Troad. 527. Sed lingua postulat nominativum; neque suum *τις*, recte dictum, Aeschylus rejuvet. V. 23. Vulgo *γάμην*. De permutatis *γάμην* et *γλάσταν*, vide Munklandum et Porsonum ad Eurip. Suppl. 547. V. 26. Vulgo *τὸν τριπάχυνον*. Scriptura manifeste prava est *Reposui πιριλιχών*. Cognitam vocem *ὑπολιχνίς* agnoscit H. anus: de qua plura piæbet Porsonus ad Hippol. 917. V. 27.

ἄργυρον—κικλητκαν. Verba nescio quis mutavit ignarus scilicet constructionis probatae, quia nominativus cum infinitivo, pro imperativo, conjungi solet. Vid. Keen ad Gregor. p. 198. Elmsleium Edinburgh Rev. No. 34. Feb. 1811. p. 493. V. 28. *'Εξ τοῦ γὰρ ἕρε-* *αιματόλοχος Νέαν τετίτα τρέι καταλίξαι*. Hæc maxime depravata alii aliter corrigere sunt conati. *Αίματολεῖχος* debetur Stanleio, qui citat v. supr. 897. *Ἄλλον ἰδεῖν αἴματος τυρκωνικοῦ*. De *μοῖρα* ad **versus* initium eliso vide Porson. ad Phœn. 1622. Loco ibi citato adde fragmentum Incerti apud Stob. R. N. p. 12. Gesn. et Soph. Ed. C. 1219. ut alibi fortasse ostendam. 1546. et V. 32. *ἀπηνίστων* Stanleius, vice *ἀπη-* *νίστων*. V. 35. Vulgo *ιεις ιειδριατος ἄνδρος*. Literas *ιει* male omissas supplevi et *ε δματος* effinxī *ἀδάματος*: *mox ἄρεος* pro *ἄνδρος*. Idem erratum correxit Piersonus ad Mær. p. 275. et ipse in Append. Troad. p. 160. De fraude ovis aureo vellere et malis inde in Atridas illatis perlegas omnino Eurip. Orest. 989 et sqq. V. 41. Vulgo *διαι*. Ipse *διαι* vocem Aeschyleam reposui. Vid. Blomfield. ad Prom. 186. in

Glossario. qui tamen in v. 534. non bene tuerit *Διονύσιος ἀπειθεὶς καὶ δίως* *ἰκφυγγάνει*: cum exhibeat Robortellus scripturam vero proximam *καὶ βίαιος*: lege *καὶ βίαιος* i. e. *καὶ ιχθύς*: even in spite of Jove: de phrasi *in βίαιος* cf. Philoct. 563, 945. et 985. in quibus omnibus *in βίαιος* idem sonant atque *βίαιος*; et s̄epe dicitur *βίαιος τιμῆς aliquo invito*. V. 46. Vulgo *αὐχής*. Reposui *αὐχής τι*. ut in sententia copulis juncta particula negativa, quam posterius membrum exhibit, in priori quoque subaudiretur. Cf. Troad. 485. et Aristoph. Ay. 694. a Musgravio citatum. V. 48. Vice *τίτλης* manifesto legendum *τίτλων*. V. 53. E *τίτλον παροῖς* erui *τίτλον γ' ἄρχεν* *δέ*: ad historiam supra dictam de ove respicit Clytaemnestra. V. 55. Vulgo *αἱ syllaba deficiente*. Atticum *ἡσθα* s̄epe librarii corrumpunt. In v. supr. 520. "Αλις παρὰ Σκάραμαδρος ἡλίθις ἀράροις nescio quis in Quarterly Rev. No. VI. p. 393. restituit *ἥσθις*: et sic legitur in marg. Ask. teste Butler. Adi quoque Lobeckum ad Soph. Aj. 611. V. 56. *πῶς, πᾶς*. in marg. Ask. exstat *πῶς, πᾶς*. Dedi *πᾶς τῶν*. V. 58. Vice *βιάζεται* reposui *λαίζεται*. Hesych. *Λαίζει*, *ταράσσει*. Cf. supr. 1436. *Μονίς* in *Φανολίθιος γ' ἄρχας Φερὲν* *ἐπικαλύπτεται*. sic enim lego vice *οὐδὲ—τύχα*. V. 60. Vulgo *όποις δὲ καὶ—πάχνα κουροβόρος*. Ipse dedi *οἱ πᾶς σε γέρε—λάχην* *χρεῖ* *βοράν*. Quam facile mutentur *οἱ* et *δὲ* patet e notis Marklandi ad Iph. A. 140. quod ad *καὶ* et *γέρε* vid. Porson ad Phœn. 1495. Mox *βαίνων λάχην* redde proiectior habendus propter *barbam crescere*. Deinde *χρεῖ* *βοράν* exponit ipse Æschylus in Eumen. 302. *Ἄρεας* *βίστημα δαμεῖναν, στὰ* necnon Suppl. 628. *Βίστημα πτυχόντις*. V. 60. *Ἴφιγίνης* expuli. V. 69. Hæc basis Anapæstica olim sedem habuit ante *οὐδὲ γέρε οὐτος*. V. 70. Vulgo *τίτλος ἀπίστης*. At non sibi invicem opponuntur *τίτλος* et *ἀπίστης* verum *τίτλον* et *ἴσθεν*. Cf. infr. 103. *παθεῖς* *ἴσθεντα* et quæ Stanleius ibi attulit. V. 72. Deest syllaba. Supplevi *οντι*. V. 74. Hic versus vulgo sequitur *βελίστην* sic mutatus *οὐδὲ απλεύσιον*. Reposui Æschyleum *οὐδέμιον* *ἰλινθι* : adisis Brunckium ad Pers. 429. et Blomfieldum in Prom. 535. V. 76. Dedi *πίπτειν* vice *θανάτην*. Eandem var. lect. exhibit X. II. 334. in Troas 778. V. 82. Pro *εὐτέλει* *λαμπεῖον* metrum et sensus postulant *εὐτάλαμπος*. V. 86. Male reposui *Ψίκας κίκλην* vice *ψίκας δὲ λίγην*. Redde *gutta* corravit. Etenim *ψίκας* est *gutta* cuiuslibet liquoris: hic pro *sanguinis* scil. Agamemnonis exsanguis. V. 100. Vulgo *Φίρεις Φίροντ*: quæ nemo expedivit. V. 101. *μίνεις θερις δότος* erui e *μίνεις* de *μετεροντος*. Cf. Aischyl. Suppl. 443. *Μένεις χρεῖ τίνεις Όμοιος θερις*. Mox *δότος*--*Δίος* est idem fere ac *Θεῖος* διδότας in Hipp. 1432. necnon *Δίος Αελότος* S. C. Th. 617. V. 107. In *πρεσβάται* hæreo. Reposui *πρέστες* *ὑψος*. V. 119. Vulgo *ιάπτων*: sed amat Æschylus *ιάλλω μίττο*. V. 121. Insertui *θεῖον* quod facile omitti poterat propter *Φεινῶν*.

Ad Choephoras accedo. Cujus fabulae duo carmina Antistrophicæ olim feliciter suis numeris restitui in *Class. Journ.* No. IX. p. 22. Verum male Epodium distribui, dum voces βελην *πιτάλλην* resecui; sic lego:

τίς δορυσθενής ἀν ἦν
ἀναλυτής δόμεων Σκύθης
ταῖς χεροῖς πα-
λίντον' ἔργα

χ', ἀς Ἀρης, βέλη πιπάλλων
σχέδιά τ' αὐτόκωπτα ναυαῖν.

Melius vero rem gessi in ejusdem Diarii No. XIII. p. 168. ubi fassus sum me nihil aut parum in Epodis emendandis proficere posse. Nunc autem metro reperto sensus quoque se prodit. Lege igitur v. 793 et sqq.

'Επει νιν μέγαν ἄρας
δίδυμα καὶ πάλιν αὖ τριπλ-
α φίλων ἄ-
ποιν ἀμείψεις.
ἐπωδὸς α'.

Vulgo καὶ τριπλᾶ παλίμποντα θίλων. Quoties autem post πάλιν excidere soleat, exemplis monet Porsonus ad Iph. T. 1396. De permuatatis θίλων et φίλων ipse dixi ad Prometheus Epodium I. Vide *Classical Journ.* No. XXII. p. 243.

V. 830 et sqq.

ἐπωδὸς β'.

Περσέως τ'	οργάς στυγηρ-
ἐν φρεσίν	αῖς ἐννόη-
σχέδιον σχέδιων,	θι, φοινίαν τ' ἄταν
ὑπὸ χθονὸς	τιθεὶς, τὸν αἰτιόν τ'
τοιν τοις τ' ἄνω	ἔξαπολλ-
πρόσσων χάριτας	ὺς μόρου.

V. 5. Vulgo ἄνων προπέρσσων. Dedi autem θεοῖς πράσσων. Similiter in Hec. 785. super ἄνω Mosq. 1. habet θεούς: unde orta est ἄνων lectio quam Aug. 1. exhibet. Mox rectius dicitur πράσσων χάριτας quam προπέρσσων: cf. Eurip. Ion. 36. et 896. V. 7. Pro λυπράς reposui στυγηράς. Excidit σι ob literam precedentem in voce οργάς et τυγχανες vix distat. λυπηράς: quod Codices fortasse exhibebant. De permuatatis r et λ, et γ et π trita sunt omnia. V. 8. Ex ἴδοσι olim eruitur λοθι. nunc malum λονθι.

In Eumenidibus sicut in Agamemnone Burneius Antispastica tria systemata repetenda esse jussit; qui rectius disponere potuit v. 328. et seqq.

Carmen illud iteratum exstat ad finem strophæ et Antistrophæ: cuius rei nullum aliud exemplum nunc temporis reperiet lector studiosus; qui bene reponet breve carmen ad finem præuentis systematis Anapæstorum, sic legendum.

'Επὶ δὲ τῷ τεθυμένῳ τόδε μέλος
παράκοπα παράφορα φρενόδαλις
ῦμνος ἡσ' Ἐγινύσαν
δέσμιος φρενῶν ἀφόρμ-
ιγκτος αἰαν-
ης βροτοῖσιν.

Vulgo ἦ: restitui ἥσ: etenim verbum desideratur: mox αἰανί nemo intellexit. Aeschylea est vox αἰανί: Vide annotata ad Pers. Cl. Jl. No. XXII. p. 246.

V. 776 et sqq.

'Ιω ίω θεοὶ	μω τὸν ίων	
νεώτεροι παλαι-	ἀντικενθῆ	
οὺς νόμους καθιππάσασθε	μεθίσα καρ-	
κάλλιχρων εῖλεσθ'. ἐγὼ δὲ ἄ-	δίας σταλαγμ-	
τιμος αἰανή βαρ-	οὺς χθονὶ	
ύκοτος ἐν γῇ τῷ δὲ	οὐνοφορον.	18
ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λι-	13 τί γέξω; γενοίμ' ἀν	19
χὴν ἀφυλλος	ένσοιστος πολίταις	
ἀτεκνος, ὡς οίκα,	ἐπαθον ὡς	
πέδον ἐπισυμ-νος	μέγαλά τοι	
βροτοφθόρους κηλίδας ἐν	εὐτυχίαισι κούρασι	
χώρᾳ βαλεῖ στυγνάζομαι,	18 νυκτὸς ἀτιμοπενθεις.	24

V. 4. Vulgo μέλισθε μου. At literæ emou, hic metro incommodæ in ꝑω mutatae reponuntur post τᾶδε, vice φῦ. V. 5. Vulgo ή τάλανα : quæ scripture, nisi vehementer erro, nascitur e gl. cum veteri lectione commixta. Ipse Aeschyleum αἰανή restitui : restituendum quoque v. 333. ἀφορμικτος αἰανή βροτος vice αὐορά : quam vocem per κραυγὴν interpretatur Brunckius ad Simonid. Fragm. i. 20. ubi lege αἰανή. V. 6. Deleto φῦ, dedi ꝑῶ τοι ιων. Libri ior ιων. Nostram scripturam exponit illud Terentianum ὅπερεν ιανην ερωμα. V. 12. Libri MSS. fortasse ἀφορον. i. e. δυσφορον. In Troas. 616. Ald. ἀφροσινασι. MSS. δυσφορούνασι. V. 18. Pro στινάξω metrum postulat quadrasyllabon ; nisi quis ē delendum malit. V. 23. Vulgo δυστυχισ.

δ35 et sqq.

'Εμὲ παθεῖν τάδε γ',	βῦμον ἀιε,	7
ἔμὲ παλαιοφρον-	μάτερ, ἀιε	
α κατὰ γῆν οἰκεῖν,	νύξ· ἀπὸ δαμιάν με τιμᾶν θεδυ	
ἀτίτον μίσος	δυσπάλαμοι παρ' οὐδὲν ἥραν δόλοι.	
πγέω τὸν μένους ἀπαντα κότον·		
τίς ὑποδέσται με πτεροῦ δύνα;		

V. 4. μένος contra metrum. Reposui μίσος. Res pro persona. Cf. Heracl. 52. v. 5. Vulgo τοι μένος ἀπαντά π. V. 6. Vice πλινέας dedi πλινή : adi Porson. ad Hec. 820. V. 8. ἀπί iteravi. Vide Seidlerum de Vers. Dochm. p. 278.

Tandem est ventum ad Supplices. E dumetis loci maxime perplexi mihi viam tali fere ratione expediam.

E v. 832. usque ad 842. nihil nisi lacunas et mendas video : idem dictum puta de v. 855, 6 ; et 865 et sqq. reliquos sic dispono.

843. στρ. α'.	ἀντιστρ. α'.
ΚΗΡΤΞ. Σεῦσθ' ἐπὶ σοῦσθε	ΧΟΡΟΣ. ὡς πολυχίμων
βᾶσιν ὅπως ποδῶν.	2 κράτος ἀποκοπά.

Delevi φόνος gl. vocis πολυχίμων.

850.

ΚΗ. βᾶθ' ἄλα πολύροθον,
διήνεκται πόρον,
βάριδις γυμφόσέτω·
δεσποισύναις τιν' ἀβρον σ'
εὐδαιμονίζω.

τοκ

ΚΗ. ἵτ' ἀπίτ· ἀναπολοῦσα βῆμα
λείψ' ἔδρανον· κιε δ' ἐς δόγυ.

*

*

στρ. β'.

861.

ἀντιστρ. β'.

ΧΟ. μήποτε πάλιν ἴδοιμ'

ἀλφεσίβοιον ὕδωρ,

ἔνθεν αἰξόμενον

νῦμα βροτοῖσι τέθα-

λε ζώφυτον *

τοκ

* * * * *

πολλὰ θροεῖς δὲ μάται' θοι·

ἐμὲ πρὶγ κακὰ παθεῖν

βλομέναις παλάμχις.

Hæc proxima non ambitiose persequar. Lector ipse, si velit, nostram scripturam cum vulgata conferre poterit. Id unum moneo quod *ἄρεα* redi debet per *παλλάκην*. Vid. Suid. V. Quod ad *εὐδαιμονίζω*, cf. Troad. 273. *Εὐδαιμονίζει παῖδα σὸν*.

V. 874. et sqq. Hos versus omnes in Antistrophica carmina disponui in *Class. Journ.* No. VI. p. 416.

Mirum fortasse nonnullis esse videbitur, quod *Æschylus* et *Euripides* se tot et tantis vinculis obstringi vellent, quæ Sophocles sibi impunit indignatus fuit. Inter hujus enim carmina Epopica vix unum *εὔποδε* alterum repieres ad eandem regulam exigendum. Profecto *equidem* me nescire quare Tragici inter se tantopere dissentiant. Scio tamen ab Aristophane legem esse, quam detexi, servatam, *Æschylum* fortasse et *Euripidem* irridendi causa. Verum alio fortasse tempore de Comici carminibus anquiram.

Etonæ Dabam,

Kalend. Jun. A. S. MCCCCXV.

BENTLEII EMENDATIONES INEDITÆ IN ARISTOPHANEM.

No. IV. [Continued from No. XXIII. p. 111.]

IN EQUITES.

4. Lego εἰσέφρησεν e Schol. At vid. Suid. in *Εἰσέφρησεν* et *"Ηρρίσεων"*.

9. πενθήσωμεν Ὄλύμπου νόμῳ Suid. in *Ευναυλίαν*.

18. Suid. Κομψευριπικῶς optime.

29. dele τῶν.

38. Ald. ποτῖν [Vid. T. KIDD. ad Porsoni Miscell. Crit. p. 371.]

42. leg. πνυχίτης [sic MSS. 3. et Schol.]
49. Suid. in Κοσκυλματίοις [habet] Κοσκυλματίοις τιτὶ : lege ἀτ-
τοῖσι ab ἄττα ut ὅτοισι in v. 755. [Vid. P. P. DOBREUM in Porso-
ni Miscell. Crit. p. 390.]
55. Suid. in Μάζα [habet] ἐκ Πύλου—παραδραμῶν—αὐτήν.
59. Hesych. Βιρσίνης, μυστίνης : vid. v. 447.
62. ποιεῖται Suid. in Μεμακκοκότα.
71. lege ἀνύσαντες
86. Scaliger βουλευσαίμεθα [sic Br. tacite.]
89. Ἀληθες ; οὗτος χρονοχυτρολήγραιον εἰ. Sic pungendum. male
Scaliger "Αληθες οὗτως forte Ἀληθες ; οὗτωσὶ χρονοχυτρολήγραιον εἰ, ut Plutarch. [De Liber. Educand. ii. p. 13.] χρονόληγρος [ubi H. Steph. voluit χρονόληγρος] vel Ἀληθες ; οὗτοὶ χρονοχυτρολήγραιον εἰ; ut χύτραις λημῶν [idem sit atque] Κρονικαῖς λήμαις λημῶντες in Plut. 581. vel Ἀληθες οὗτος ὁ χρονοχυτρολήγραιον : vid. Achar. 556. Ran. 864. Vesp. 1403. Av. 174. ib. 1048.
93. κρίνουσι. Etymol. in Οἰνος.
103. λείχων Etymol. in Ἐπίπαστα. male.
107. ἔλχ' ἔλχε. Ald. ἔλε χ' ἔλκε : vel leg. ἔχε χ' ἔλκε : vid.
1184. ἔχε καὶ πιεῖν. Vesp. 1130. "Ἐχε—καὶ μὴ λαλεῖ."
121. φήσιν lege φήσ' [sic Kust. cf. 195.]
124. διεχρήτῳ Atheneus xi. p. 460.
134. ἀνήρ : lege αὐτὸς [sic melius DOBREUS in Monthly Rev. Append. V. iii. p. 522. ἀνὴρ ἔτερος collato v. infr. 328.]
136. fo. ὁ Παφλαγών. semper enim hic primam corripit. [Sic MSS.]
164. In Schol. φησὶ γάρ ἄρκεις τοῦ λαοῦ : leg. ἑλεοῦ : cf. 152. et
169. et Hesych. V. ἀρχέλας—τοῦ ἑλαίου leg. ἑλεοῦ.
165. lege Ηνυκός. [sic Kust. in Not. et MSS. 3.]
167. In Schol. λαικάσεις—σιτήσεις—ὅθεν καὶ λαικάστρια ἡ πόρη.
adscripsit Bentl. [ex Hesychio] Αισίτος κύναίδος, πόρη. quod pro-
pius accedit ad σιτήσεις.
174. Scal. Χαλκηδόνα : Vide Palmer. et ad 1300.
175. Cf. Av. 178. [Vid. ad 1160.]
187. Melior altera lectio apud Schol. ὅτου. Vid. 1215, 6. Av.
1616. Pac. 888. [Plura habes apud Porson. ad Androm. 651.
Advers. p. 225.]
- Ibid. leg. λέλογχας, sed cf. Pac. 591.
193. lege ἐς. [Causam non video.]
208. lege ἐσθ' δ' τ' [sic, ni fallor, ELMISLEIUS.]
209. leg. τοῦ βυρσαίτου "Ηδη κρατήσειν."
219. Bas. ἀπαντα τὰ πρὸς πολιτοίαν : dele τά. [Sic MSS. 3.]
238. leg. ἐσθ' ὅτως [sic MS. Rav.]
242. leg. παραγένεσθε [sic Brunck.]
245. ὅμοι προκοπιμένων. leg. ὅμοι πικειμένου vid. p. 17. [non in-

telligo quid Bentleius velit.] et v. 266. Εὐνεπικεῖσθ': an leg. προσχωμένον: vid. 758. προσκείσθαι: [Kuster. habet προσκείμενον.]

262. Ipse Schol. legebat ἀγχυλίσας: male. [Vid. VV. DD. ad Iph. T. 1408.]

263. ἐνεκολάβησας Suid. in Ἀγχύρισμα, et Ἐκολάβητας. lege ἐνεκολάβησας ex Hesychio. Vid. et Κολυβίζειν et Κολοιβόζειν. Ego malim ἐνεκολάβητας. Vid. Hesych. Κολαχρίζειν. Sed κοληβάζειν ut κυρηβάζειν v. 272. [Brunckius quoque ἐνεκολάβησας.]

Ibid. In Schol. ἀκινος] lege κόλαβος. δι μικρὸς ζωκὸς Suid. sed vid. Hesych. in Ἐνεκολῆβησε.

Ibid. Schol. ἀργυρίζεται.] leg. ἀγχυρίζεται.

270. ὠσπερεὶ Suid. in ὑπέρχεται. Sed forte χώσπερει.

272. Εἰ δ' ἔκκλινε γε Suid. in Κυρηβάσει. [MS. Rav. ἦν δ' ἔκκλινη.]

277. Cf. Thesm. 100.

287. lege σὲ [sic Brunck. e Prisciano. p. 234. fol. vers. ed. Ald. = 1187. Putsch.]

292. lege vel εἰς ἔμ' vel εἰς μ' [et sic MS. Rav.] Etymol. V. Σκαρδαμύσσειν habet εἰς ἔμε [nequon Suid. V. Ἀσκαρδαμυκτί.]

300. so. φανῶ· γώ. vid. Achar. 827. vel σέ γε φανῶ. vid. Ach. 914. καὶ σέ γε φανῶ: μιμο φαίνω: cf. ibid. 917. ἔπειτα φαίνεις. Athen. in. p. 94. D. Ἀριστοφάνης in Ἰππεῦσι, καὶ σε φήσω ἀδεκατεύτους κατιλας πωλεῖν.

303. στρ. α'. 381. ἀντιστρ. α'. 322. στρ. β'. 396. ἀντιστρ. β'. [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 189.]

304. dele καὶ κέκρακτα τοῦ.

312. leg. ἡμιν ποκ Suid. ἀνακεκώφηκας.

319. Bas. καὶ νὴ Δία κάμε τοῦ ἔδρασε. Ald. καὶ delet. Scribe κάμε ἡν Δία [et sic Kuster.] vel κάμε γοῦτ' ἔδρασε, νὴ Δὶ [sic Porson. Praef. Ille. p. xlvi.]

325. dele τῶν [sic HERMANN. l. c.]

327. Ἰππόδαμος Suid. in Λείβεται. [monuit idem Kuster.]

330. πάρεστι ὄηλος.] lege παρέλθων ὄηλος Vid. Schol. [MSS. rectius πάρεστι.]

331. lege ex Antistrophea versu πανουργίᾳ deleto ἐν. [sic MSS. ε.]

338. οὐ μὰ Δὶ : dele οὐ [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 153.]

339. ἐγώ σ' οὐ: lege σ' ἐγώ οὐ [sic Brunck.]

340. leg. πάρες πάρες πρός : [sic MSS. 4. et Junt.]

341. lege ἐναντὶ [Hotibus. Lect. Aristoph. p. 62. ἐναντα. BURNEIUS Monthly Rev. Sept. 1789. p. 253. λέγενται ἐναντίον μου.]

357. καὶ Νικίαν ταράξω. Cur hoc? cum Nicias et Demosthenes hic ab ejus partibus stent. for. καὶ σφηκιαν ταράξω: ut Vesp. 229. σφηκιαν διατειδῶ. Sed de Nicia adolescenti Rhetore vid. Eccl.

428. δημοιος Νικία. Athenaeus p. 94. in utroque loco agnoscit Νικία.

[necnon Plutarch. in Nicias p. 525. citatus a Kustero.]

359. lege μόνον. At μόνος Suid. in Προσίτεται.
365. lege κάμε γ' ἔλκε τοῦτον ἡγεμόνην ἐλκῆς vel κάμε γ' ἔλκε' ἡγεμόνη.
369. In Schol. σώματος] leg. δέρματος.
366. στρ. 460. ἀντιστρ.
373. leg. πρηγορῶντα.
384. leg. οὐκ ἄρ' ἡν. Vid. Schol. [sic MSS. 4.]
388. leg. ἐπὶ [sic Brunck.]
393. Suid. in Ἀμάρουνοι habet λέγεται : an leg. γλίσχεται : sed βούλεται idem in Ἀφάνει.
399. In Schol. legit Bentl. Ἄλλ' ἐπανατρέψαι βούλοματι γ' εἰς τὸν λόγον Πρότερον ἐκεῖνος πρὸς ἑτέραν γυναικίν' ἔχων Τὸν νοῦν πακᾶς εἴπως πρὸς ἑτέραν ἄλλ' ἄμα—
400. Μηρσίμων Suid. in Κάδιον. ut Μορσίμου in Μόρσιμος.
405. Schol. παιδοπίην. At πυρροπίην Suid. in Ω περὶ πάντα.
406. καὶ παιῶνα δῆ. Suid. ἢ παιωνίσαι in Ω περὶ πάντα e Schol. γρ. παιωνίσαι ἡ ἥσθεντ' ἵη παιῶν' ἀσαι [ut duo MSS.]
- Ibid. Antiphanes apud Athen. p. 508. Ἐπειτα μηδὲν τῶν ἀπηρχαιωμένων Τούτων περίην τὸν Τελάμωνα μηδὲ τὸν Παιῶνα μηδὲ Αρμόδιον.
410. μαχαιρίδῶν Pollux X. 104.
412. s. Suid. Ἀπομαγδαλίας.
417. ὄρατ' ἄρα Suid. in Νέα χελιδών.
419. fo. deleand. ως : vid. 453. [sic Porson. Præf. p. xli.]
420. In Schol. ἀνισέον γ' [Vide Porson. Advers. p. 33. et sqq.]
422. lege Κοχώνα dualis numeri. Hesych. Κοχώνα. τὰ ὕρχια.
- Sed vid. 482. [unde patet Bentl. voluisse τὰς κοχώνας quod MSS.]
3. habent.]
- Ibid. leg. ἀπάμνυν [et sic Brunck.]
426. leg. ἐπιώρχεις [sic Brunck.]
428. Cf. 757.
433. In Schol. fo. Εό δῆ ἐκεῖνος [atqui vera lectio est ὄμεν δ'.]
- Vid. Archiloch. Fragm. xxviii.
435. γε deest in Frob.
- Ibid. lege κακίας [quasi voluisset Bentl. καὶ αἰκίας.]
- Ibid. In Schol. ad Νότον scripsit. “Stulte interpretatur Νότον. nam Cæcias a Solsticio astivo flat. Hinc autem, quod κακίας παραδεῖ poeta, Salmasii error arguitur qui κακίας scribit τετρασυλλαβῶς in Notis ad Solinum.”
- Ibid. Ad finem Schol. Κάκ' ἐφ' αὐτὸν ἔλκων ως ὁ Κακίας νέφος.
443. fo. ἀλισηγῶν Soph. [CEd. C. 363.] et Suid. in Ἀλισήγιος.
463. leg. πράττει [sic Brunck.]
469. fo. αὐλ' : vid. 499.
470. leg. ξυνάμνυτε [sic MSS. 2.]
501. leg. πρέσχετε [vid. ad Nub.]

505. In Argumento Nubium sic habetur 'Ηνάγκαζεν λέξοντας ἐπη
πρὸς τὸ Θέατρον [sic Porsonus in *Maty's Rev.* = Miscell. Crit. p.
28. et Praef. p. lv.]
510. φέσ., to. πώσ.
519. In Schol. *Βατραχός*: leg. βατραχίς. [sic Kuster. in Not.]
524. παρασύρων Suid. in Στάσις. At παρασύρας Etymol. in
Λιφελέρ.
526. Ευμποσίοις Suid. in Λιφελεῖα.
531. In Schol. νικήσῃ. Suid. σε φιλήσῃ in Κοννᾶς μέθυσος.
535. ἡμᾶς Suid. in Στυφελισμούς.
541. leg. τούτων οὐν [Ita MS. Rav. Kusterus γοῦν probante
Brunckio.]
543. Suidas 'Αποπέμψατ' ἐφ' ἔνδεκα : an leg. παραπέμψατέ θ' ἔνδε-
κα : at Suid. 'Εφ' ἔνδεκα.
549. ὑπῶν : leg. ὄπλῶν [*ungularum* : vid. Schol.]
559. In Schol. μῶρον : Ald. μῦθον.
561. Scal. παρεστός.
566. leg. καῦτις [sic Porson. *Maty's Rev.* = Misc. Crit. p. 34.]
567. " leg. Ἡρέμησεν ut Suid. MStus. ubi codd. vulgati ἥριθμη-
σεν." Lud. Kuster.
569. τοῦτ' exhibet Suid. in 'Απεψησάμην et Ψευδόπτωμα. lege
χάρτ.
577. In Schol. Suid. in Στλεγγῆις habet Ούδ' ἔστιν αὐτή.
580. fo. leg. πολι—ταῖς.
597. καὶ ante σκόρδα deest in Athen. xi. p. 483. D.
602. leg. μετήσαν [sic MSS. 2.]
605. leg. ἐφ [sic ed. Junct. et MSS. 2.] et similiter in Schol.
607. leg. μήτε γῆ [sic Brunck.]
615. leg. εἰργασμέν' [sic MSS. 2.] vel ἐγγασάμεν' [sic HER-
MANN. de Metis. p. 367.]
616. fo. ἀπαν.
626. leg. πιθανώταβ' ἡ βουλὴ δ' [sic Membr.]
627. Suid. Ψευδατραφάξυος.
630. leg. τοῖς [sic MSS. 2.]
631. Suid. Σχίταλοι τε καὶ Φεν. Sed Σχίταλοι ut Κόβαλοι Σχίτα-
λοι etiam Hesych. sed forte Σχιμᾶλοι, ἀπὸ τοῦ σκιμαλίζειν. Vid.
Ach. 443.
632. Βερέσχεδοι. Suidas quoque agnoscit et in Σχίταλοι : sed
nil addit unde dictum. Evidem mendosum putaverim et scrip-
serim 'Ερεσχελοι : quod dictum ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐρεσχελεῖν sensu aptissimo.
- Ibid. fo. μόθων [sic Kuster.]
634. leg. γλῶτταν [sic MSS.]
641. leg. ἐξήγαξα [sic Brunck.]
645. leg. ἀπορρήτῳ πειησμένοις Ταχύ.
659. Athen. vii. p. 328. γένοιντ': fo. γένοιντ' ἄν. Sed et At-
tici sic ut alibi. Tι δῆτα πόδες ἄν οὐκ ἀν εἰγγασαλατο. [Av. 1147.]

669. Scal. ιστυκότες, at recte ιστηκότες, surrexerunt scil. abituri.
670. Suid. ἐφέτω. Vid. Lys. 129.
677. Suid. Τπερ επυπάζοντε : fo. χ' ὑπερ—
680. leg. πέπραγας [sic MSS. 4.]
683. fo. δόλοις et ρήμασιν θ' [sic MSS. 2.]
690. lego με μορμών : sed Eustath. [Δ. Σ. = 1204. Bas. neccnon Suid. V. Μορμώ] μορμώ τοῦ θράσους i. e. ὡς τοῦ [vel φεῦ τοῦ] θρ.
694. fo. περιεκίκκισα. At Suid.—κυσα in Απεπυδάρισα.
697. leg. ἐγώ δέ γ' οὐ μή σ' ἔκπισ.
713. leg. καθ' ὥσπερ [sic Dawes. et MS.]
718. Suid. in Ηρωκτὸς habet τοῦτογε. voluit, credo, τούτογι [MS. Rav. τοῦτο τι. unde Elmsleius ad Achard. 108. in Auctar. τούτογι.]
723. leg. δημαχίδιον : vid. 820. ubi tamen δημαχίδιον Θدام producit. an legend. ὡς φίλτατον δημιδίον.
739. leg. ὑπόδραμων τοὺς ἐκ πύλου. Vid. Nub. 186. Eq. 1198. [sed melius Br. ὑπόδραμων τοὺς ἐν πύλῳ e Scholiastæ verbis.]
748. fo. ὡς τὸ πρόσθε : vid. Nub. 593. Ach. 241. [sic Brunck. tacite post Casaubonum.]
753. στρ. 832. ἀντιστρ.
- Ibid. In Schol. epigramma est Crinagoræ.
754. φρονέν καὶ λόχους Suid. in Nub.
756. fo. εὐμήχανος πορίζειν cf. Eccl. 236. πορίζειν εὐπορώτατον [sic Brunck. collato Hesych. Prom. 59. δεινὸς γὰρ ευρεῖν.]
757. ἔστι. leg. ἔεινται : ut πολλῷ ἔειντι [cetera legere nequeo. At cf. Polluc. iv. 21. πολλῷ ἔειν.]
- Ibid. Cf. 428.
758. Suid. in Δελφὶν habet προσικέσθαι του [et sic Rav.]
- Ibid. In Schol. fo. 'Ο δε δελφίς' τε : ποι pro κέρδος Salmas [Plinian. Euseb. p. 402.] κερδοῦχος ὁ διακόψι : vel potius ὁ : ut Aristophanei Anapæsti sint : ποι fo. τὸ σκάφος [at τοῦδερος agnoscit Schol. Thucyd. viii. 41.]
760. leg. τῇ δεσποινῇ μὲν Αθηναίῃ.
773. lege χαρισοίμην. [ita Brunck.]
778. dele ἐν : vid. 1331. Ach. 697. Thesm. 813. Epigramma apud Suid. in Ποικίλη στοά. [sic quoque Brunck. collato Critiae versu apud Athen. p. 28. C.]
780. leg. τῆς πέτρας vid. 751.
784. leg. ὡς τοῦτ' ἔστιν τούργον.
789. leg. ταῖς πιθάκναισι [sic Dawes. et MSS.]
790. γυναρίοις. Etsi præter Scholiastem Hesych. et Suid. hanc lectionem agnoscant, tamen eas interpretationes ex solo hoc loco profluxisse credo, et lego Καὶ γυγγαθλοῖς καὶ πυργιδοῖς : certe cum τιθάκναις convenit. an leg. Καὶ καλυβαθλοῖς. Καλύβας in illa parte memorat Thucydides.
790. leg. ἐλεαίρου.

794. Ἀρθητικῶν Suid. et Schol. Hesych. φασιπυγίζειν.
799. leg. ἀρπάζεις [sic MS.]
800. καθοράται Suid. in Ὁμίχλῃ.
803. στεμφύλων. fo. σταφυλῶν vel καὶ τῆμπέλω ut Pac. 556. Cf. et infr. 1297. ἀλλήλαις ξυνελθεῖν τὰς τρίητες εἰς λόγον.
806. leg. σαντοῦ [ita Brunck.]
818. παῦ' οὐτοσί. lege παῦ' ὁ οὗτος : vid. Vesp. 1355. vel οὔτωσί. [sic Kuster.] an παύου οὗτος vel παῦε παῦ' οὗτος Vid. 915. Vesp. 37.
- [820. Olim voluit Bentl. δημάχιδιον ἄν. sed postea sententiam mutavit ob dicta ad v. 723.]
823. leg. χειροῦ [ita Brunck.]
840. Suid. Ἐμοὶ δὲ τοιούτοι.
851. κατασπάσαντες Suid. in Βριμῆσαι. [et sic MS. Rav.]
861. ὅταν : fo. οἴ γ' ἀν :
863. Etymol. in Ἔγχελος et Athen. VII. p. 299. αἱροῦσι [sic MSS.]
865. dele γε [sic Brunck.]
869. leg. ὅσων γε.
871. leg. τοσούτοι : [quod comprobaturus est fortasse Elmsleius.]
873. Ἰρύπον Suid. in Ἰρύττον.
874. βινουμένους Suid. in Βινεῖν et Ἰρύττος : sed vid. Nub. 1099.
877. leg. τηλικούτον [sic Brunck.]
880. Suid. Τοιούτονι.
887. leg. σὺ δὲ οἵμως ὁ πόνω πόνηρος.
888. Αἰβοῖ. Οὐκ ἐξ κόρακας : ut αἰβοῖ sit extra versum, ut φεῦ et similia : sic Av. 1342. De πόνω πόνηρε vid. Vesp. 464. Lys. 350. et Hesych.
903. fo. καὶ τοῦτο γέ ἐπιτηδεῖς [et sic Elmsleius Edinburgh Rev. No. 37. p. 87.]
891. leg. τὸν σιλφίου.
893. leg. τοῦτ' εἶπε Κόπριος ἀνήρ. Suid. Κόπριος ἀνήρ : vel dele καὶ [voluit quoque Bentl. fortasse καὶ deleto] πρὸς ἐμὲ τοῦτ' ἀνὴρ Κοπρεαῖος εἶπε.
905. fo. ὀφθαλμίω.
917. Au leg. δετῶν α δεταὶ, λαμπάδες; δᾶδες. Suid. in Ἄφελκτέον habet τῶν δᾶδων καὶ ἀπαρχυστέον τῶν κρεῶν. fo. τῶν δᾶδίων vel δαλίων. Vid. Suid. in Δάλιον et Pac. 959. [ubi Bentl. reposuit δάλιον e Suida in V.]
965. Suid. Σμηκίθην [et Kuster.]
971. leg. τοῖς ἀφιξομένοισιν ἐ—ἀν καλ— vel τοῖσι δεῦρ' ἀφικνουμένοις [sic HERMANN. de Metr. p. 232.]
977. γένοιθ' Suid. in Δοθνξ. Scal. γένεθ' [et sic HERMANN. l. c.]
979. lege δύο cum Suid. [sic MSS.]
980. In Schol. Suidas in Τορύη legit ἔτυδόκον : sed recte ἔτυ-

δόνον [etenim Ald. ἐπιοδόνον] ἀπὸ τοῦ δονεῖν: quippe est τὸ κινητήριον τοῦ ἔτνους. Lego etiam Τορύνη τίσις ὡς δὴ ξίφος ὑπέξωσμένος. Male Kusterus [Verba inter Scholia suo auctori vindicat Kuster. ad Κνῆστις et Τουρ. ad Suid. V. Τανάχαλκος. nempe Leonide Taren-tini Ep. xiv.]

987. λαβεῖν Suid. in Δωριστὶ.

992. lege δωροδοκιστὶ ut Suid. in Δωριστὶ: sed —κηστὶ in Τὴν Δωριστὶ [et sic MSS. 3.]

996. Vid. Ran. 1211.

Ibid. κιθωτός: vid. Vesp. 1051.

1006. [Fortasse Bentl. περὶ ἀπάντων πραγμάτων delere voluit: sed mentem ejus non satis bene video.]

1019. leg. Ἐρεχθίδεῖ χολοίοις.

1025. leg. δῆτ'. [olim δῆ.]

1039. leg. ἔφραξεν Vid. 1045. [sic Brunck.]

1083. In Schol. “Ex Schol. in Av. 1379. et Suid. in Κυλλὸς lege “Οὐτὶ χωλός ἔστι τὴν ἐτέραν χειρὶ οὐ λέγεις.”

1088. lege μοι ὅσκει vel μου ὅσκει vid. 997.

1092. Suid. Ἀριβάλλω.

1115. πρός τε τὸν Frob. et Suid. in Εὔπαράγωγος.

1123. ταπεινῶσαι Suid. in Βρύλλων ε gl.

1128. τοίνις Suid. in Ηὐχνός.

1139. Froben. περιεύχομαι. Ald. περιεργχ— et Suid. in V.

1160. leg. εἰ γὰρ [Conferre poterat Bentl. 175. et Av. 178.]

1175. Ὁθριμοπάτρα Athen. p. 94. E.

1202. leg. οὐ γὰρ ἀλλὰ [Mentem Bentleii non intelligo: vid. ad Ran. 103.]

1215. leg. ὄσων [sic Reiskius et MSS. 3.]

1227. lege οὐ δένεστε μ' [sic BURNEIUS in Monthly Rev. Feb. 1796.]

1237. Ald. κλέπτων recte. [sic MSS.]

1249. Οὐχὶ μᾶλλον vice οὐκ ἀν Suid. in Οὐχὶ. In Alcest. 180. · hodie habetur οὐκ ἀν.

1253. ἔσθιμι Suid. in Φανός. [sic Porsonus in, Maty's Rev. = Misc. Crit. p. 35.]

1265. Ald. Θούμαγτιν sed in Schol. Θούμαγτιν ut alibi vid. Schol. Av. 1400i. Θούφραστος [Vesp. 1305.] Θουκυδίης [Ach. 703.] [Adde Θουφάνης Eq. 1100.]

Ibid. τὸν ἀγέστιον Suid. in Ἀνέστιος Θούμαγτις Λυσίστρατος [et sic Rav.]

1266. λυπεῖν Suid. in Αυσ—: λιπεῖν in Αυσ— et Θουμ— At ēs Αυσίστρατον non convenit cum λυπεῖν.

1268. lege θαλεροῖς et [in antistrophico] 1294. ἀν ὄμως [MSS. ἀλλ' ὄμως teste Brunckio.]

1270. Πυθῶν iv: lege Πυθῶδ̄ iās: vid. Av. 188. iēnai—Πυθῶδ̄.

1272. Λοιδορεῖσθαι Suidas. vid. Pac. 57. sed λοιδορῆσαι in Lys.
 1130.
1275. Suid. Ὄστις οὐχ.
 1279. fo. ἡχθόμην.
1282. Steph. Byz. *Κασσώριον*. lege simplici σ. non σσ : ex lege metri et ordine literarum. sequitur vocem *Καστάλου*. Scribe ergo hic Ἐν *Καστωρίσι*. Suid. *Κάσσωρος*. Idem tamen *Κασταύρισι*. Hesych. utrumque et *Κασταύρειον* et *Καστωρεῖον*.
1286. lege οὐποτ': ut Suid. in *Πολυμνηστεια*.
1291. lege φασὶ μὲν γάρ.
1300. fo. Χαλκήδονα : cf. 174. et vide Palmer.
1308. lege Ἀθηναῖοις—δοκεῖ.
1316. lege ἐπίκουρ' ὡ λαμπρὸν φέγγος vel ἐπίκουρε φανεῖς καὶ [et sic Valck. ad Hipp. 1122.] vid. 149. 456. et 832.
1321. forte πολαν σκεῦη [sic spatio interposito] χοῖος γεγίνηται.
1324. lege ταῖς φαινομέναις ταῖσδ'.
 1329. leg. τεττιγοφόρος κάρχαιών vel — φορῶν ἀρχαῖων.
 1331. lege τοῦ Μαραθῶν. vid. Aeh. 697.
1335. Olim deleverat γάρ : mox adscr̄psit “ Immo lege γάρ et ὅΓ θρασ.”
1336. Ald. ἦν.
1349. leg. τοῦτ' [aliter Elmsleius ad Achar. 178. in Auctario.]
1367. μετεγγραφήσεται Suid. in *Κατάλογος*. [sic Brunck.]
1378. Scal. hunc versum obelisco jugulat. [Vid. Schol.]
1389. leg. ἐλαβεῖς αὐτᾶς [ita Brunck.]
1390. lege σύ γε vel σὺ μὴ [sic MSS.] vel μὴ συλλάβης.

IN ACHARNENSES.

9. In Schol. *Αίμναις* : fo. Αημναις fab. Aristoph. [ita Kuster.]
10. lege δὴ κεχήνη vel κέχηνα : prius verum. et sic Etymol. in *Ἐπεποιήσιν* [p. 84. fol. vers. Ald.=386. Sylb.]
18. dele γε et sic Suid. in *Ρύπτομαι* [ita Porson Maty's Rev. p. 65.=Misc. Crit. p. 29.]—23. *Ἀωρίᾳ* Suid.
68. vel dele articulum vel potius lege ἐτρυχόμεθα [sic Brunck.]
78. καταφαγεῖν τε : dele κατα vel τε [sic MS.]
86. Athen. p. 130.
96. νεωρικὸν Schol. [νεώριον in Kust.]
103. Ald. ὑμῖν.—105. sic dispone ΔΙ—ΚΗ. [sic MSS.]
106. ΔΙ.
108. ΚΗ. { sic MSS.
109. ΔΙ. { sic MSS.
110. deletur ΔΙ. {
108. leg. ὅδε γε.
113. Σαρδηνιακόν : leg. Σαρδιανικόν. Et sic Suid. *Ινα μή σε βάψω*.

Ald. Σαρδιανικόν. At in Schol. habet σαρδιανικόν. Vid. Hesych.
in Βάρμια Σαρδιανικόν.

114, 5. ἀνανεύει et ἐπινεύει lineis circumdedit Bentl. [sic alii.]

116. ἐνθάδ' Suid. in Αύτοθεν.

119. ἔξυρημένε et Τοισθύδε δῆ Suid. in Κλεισθένη [Ita ELM. SL.]

120. In Schol. ἐπών leg. ἐπωδῶν.

Ibid. παρεύθηκεν.] Immo non parodia, sed vera lectio est τοιάνδε—
πυγήν.

[127. In Schol. lege Πεπταμέναι νεγίκανται θύραι Tyrwhitt.]

128. οὐδέ ποτ' Ἰσχεὶ γ' ή θύρα Suid. in Ἰσχεὶ [Ita Brunck.]

134. dele ΚΗ. θεώρ' et sic Ald. [ita tacite Br.]

144. leg. ὕγραφ' et sic Ald. [ita MSS. et Dawes. p. 250.] ὕγρα-
φου Suid. in Καλοῦ.

158. lege ἀποτεθρίακεν ex Hesych. et Suid. in Ἀποτεθ-. Ὁδομ- et
Πέος.

161. lege μέν τ' ἀν γ' [ita Brunck.] vel ἀρ'..

179. lege potius στυπτοὶ a στύφειν. [ita MSS. 2.] Erotianus ci-
tat in serie sua Στεριφνοὶ quod potius στρυφνοὶ [fasset] Hesych.
Στρυφνὸν, ἀπεστυμένον. sed Etymol. in Ἀτεράμων habet στρητοῖ.
idem in sua serie male Σιπτοῖ.

199. } dele { AM. } [sic MS.]

200. } { AI. } [sic MS.]

199. fo. χλαίειν κελεύων. [Hoc tuetur Schol. et MSS. illo non
opus est.]

203. Inter Schol. “Immo tria tantum τρίβρυθμα. catētra δίβρυθμα.”

209. τῶν ante ἐμῶν omittit Suid. in Φάυλλος.

216. dele ἔξεφυγεν. est interpretatio τοῦ ἀπεπλήξατο [sic ELM. SL.]

217. ἀν Suid. in Ἀπεπλήξατο : at δῆ in Φάυλλος.

219. lege Λακρατεῖδη : at Suid. et Hesych. Λακρατίδας.

229. leg. ἀντεμπαγῶ : vid. [325.] 526. Ἀντεξέκλεψαν. quin et
Suid. in Σχοῖνος habet ἀντεμπαγῶ. et iterum in Σκόλοψ. in editione
Kusteri qui perperam hanc lectionem dominat : ego vero divinave-
ram. [sic ELM. SL.]

237. legē σῆγα—ἀρα [sic Br.]

262. leg. Βαχχίου [ita Scaliger.]

267. περιποιησόμενος Suid. in Λαμάχων.

270. leg. πολλῶ—ἴστῳ [ita MSS. Dawes. et Scal.]

272. Στρυμοδώρου Suid. in Φέλλα : Vid. Vesp. 293. at Στρυμο-
in Θράτταν. vid. Argument. Lysistratae.

274. Collato Thesm. 1221. legisse velle videtur Bentl. καταλα-
βόντα.

278. In Schol. ὡς καλλίας δηλοῖ. leg. καὶ ἄλλως δηλοῖ scil. Lys.
107.

283, 4, 5. στρ. α'. 394, 5, 6. ἀντιστρ. α'.

286. et quinque sqq. στρ. β'. 397. et sqq. ἀντιστρ. β'.

293. στρ. γ'. 341. ἀντιστρ. γ'.
 296. et sqq. στρ. δ'. 343. et sqq. ἀντιστρ. δ'.
 293. lege vel σοῦ γ' ἔγω 'κούσομ' ut 302 vel ἀκούσαιμεν.
 294. lege καὶ καταχωσομεν.
 295. lege πρὸν ἄν γ' ἀκούσητ' [ita ELMsl.]
 300. ποτε omittit Suid. in *Κατατεμῶ* et *Καττύματα*. Cretici sicut
 hoc modo—γὼ κατατεμῶ ποθ' ἵππευσιν ἐς καττύματα ut alibi δεξά σε
 θύλακον κλοπῆς. [Eq. 369.]
 320. fo. ἡμιν. —321. οὐδὲ inserit Bentl. [sic MSS.]
 324. ἀρ' omittit Ald. lege χ' ὑμᾶς vel δῆξομ' ἀρ' [ita Dawes.]
 328. leg. 'Αχαρνίκοισι; μῶν ὑμῶν [ita ELMsl.]
 335. ἄρα: leg. σύ.
 336. ante ἀγριώς inserit Bentl. ὑμεῖς [sic MSS.]
 337. leg. νῦν [ita ELMsl.]
 338. leg. ὅττῳ [Scal. ὅτῳ e Schol.]
 340. leg. τοὺς λίθους νῦν μοι [ita Brunck.] vel τοὺς μὲν νῦν λίθους
 [ita ELMsl.]
 345. Schol. στρόφιγγι pro var. lect. lege ergo 'Ως δὲ γε σειστὸς
 ἄμα τε τῇ στρόφιγγι γίγνεται. et Trochaicus respondere debet Stro-
 phae—γὼ κατατεμῶ τοῖσιν ἵππευσιν ποτ' ἐς καττύματα.
 [346. Tyrwhitt. fo. Βοὴν [sic Rav.] et mox ἀπέλανετ'.]
 346. Male Scholiastes: Distingue post βοής: quod vocativus
 pluralis est a βοϊς, θύλακος.
 347. fo. Παρνήθιοι: Vid. Steph. Byz. V. Πάρνης. Suid. Παρ-
 νάσιοι.
 349. Erotianus in *Μαριλῆνοι* legit ὑπὸ μαρίλης ἀλόσυχην. leg.
 ἀλὸς ἀχηνη vel ἀλοσύδην: sed recte τῆς μαρίλης συχνὴν, ut Pac. 107.
 τῆς γῆς πολλὴν.
 350. ἐτ—Suid. in *Ἐπετίλησεν*, Λάρχος et *Μαρίλη*.
 361. lege πόθος ἄρα γε πάνευ με.
 362. φονεῖς: immo leg. φρονεῖς [et sic MSS.] et ὅττι.
 367. Hesych. quoque agnoscit Οὐκ ἴνασπιδώσημαι. forte tamen
 οὐ γένος προδώσομαι. vid. Nub. 1222. et Av. 1451.
 387. σκυτοδατο—Suid. in Αἴδος κονῆ.
 391. σκῆψιν ἀγῶν—οὐ προσδέξεται Suid. in *Σισυφος*. fo. ἀγῶν [Por-
 son Maty's Rev. p. 65. = Mise. Crit. p. 29. ἀγῶν.]
 399. τραχωδίαν Suid. in *Αναβάσην*. Αὔτος. Οὐκ. 'Ενδον.
 400. fo. σοφῶς [sic Markland. Suppl. 639.]
 403 et 406. Ex hemisticithis duobus unius senarius efficitur.
 412. fo. πτωχοὺς [sic Tyrwhitt.]
 422. leg. ἀνήρ [sic Brunck.] sed vid. 478.
 434. καὶ κακόπτα Suid. in *Διόστα*.—436. dele μοι [sic Brunck.]
 431. εὐριπίδη Suid. in *Γλίσχρος*: Εὐριπίδης in *Λιπαρᾶ*. lege et
 distingue *Γλίσχρος* προσαιτῶν λιπαρῶν Εὐριπίδη [sic ELMsl.] vel ὁ
 εὐριπίδη: vid. ad 474. et Thesm. 4.

452. σπυρίδη διακεκαυμένον λύχνον Suid. in Διακεκαυμένον : at σπυρίδην διακεκαυμένην λύχνων in Σπυρίδην.

453. γε. omittit Suid. in Διακεκαυμένον. fo. σο [ita ELM. SL.]

457. μὴ ἀλλα : vid. Ran. 103.

458. κυλίκιον Suid. in Ἀποκεκρουσμένον et Κύλιξ. at κοτυλίσκιον Athen. p. 479. B.

Ibid. ἀποκεκρουμένον. Eustath. sed ἀποκεκρουσμένον Excerpt. et Eustath. [p. 1282.=1389.] notante Casaub.

462. Ald. σφογγύιον.

474. Suid. in φιλάταιον habet Ὡ Εύριπδιον γλυκύτατον ὡ φιλάταιον. lege ὡ εὐρυπίδιον (vid. ad Thesm. 4.)—φιλάτατον. Vid. Hesych. [Φιλάτατος] et Eustath. [Ὀδ. B. p. 1441=90 ex Xenoph. Hist. Gr. v. 1. 3. 7. ubi Eustathii teste ed. Rom. alii libri legunt φιλέτατον. et φιλότατον teste ed. Bas.]

479. απέκπορευτία [sic tacite Dawes. p. 253.]

488. τί φήσεις] fo. ἄνεγ. (sic.)

[500]. f. καύτοῖς. Tyrwhitt. Ita MS. Rav.]

511. Suid. Παρακεκρυμένα ut mox in 516. vel leg. ἵστ' ἀμπέλια παρακεκρυμένα.

519. ἴδοισν Suid. in Σίκιον. [vid. Dawes. p. 253.] olim voluit Bentl. γε σίκιον εἶδεν vel σίκιον οὐ.]

529. In Schol. legit Bentl. χῶσπερ οἰγόντος δρομεῖς Ἐκκαιδεκαποδῆραι—αὐτῷ—ἐπικάθιζεν—et addit ex Aristide Orat. pro 4 vir. p. 215. Ῥητῶς γάρ ἔστι νῦν τις εἰ γ' ἔστιν λέγειν 'Ο Βουζύνης ἀριστος ὡ λιτής γιος, [quos versus posse erui videant neque Toup. ad Longin. c. xxixv. neque Wyttenbach. ad Plutarch. S. N. V. p. 7.]

530. leg. Ἡστραπή [e Plin. Epist. 1. 20.]

532. lege μήτε γῆ vid. Vesp. 22. [rectius citasset Eq. 610.]

[534. fo. πείνων ἀδην. Tyrwhitt.]

562. leg. αὔτι [non improbante ELM. SL.]

576. Κακορροθεῖ Suid. et alii : sed rectius videtur κακοθροῖται κακοθροῦς [at ἐ corripi debet ante θρ. in omnente Dawesio]

583. Suid. Μογιώ. 608. Ἀμήγεποι. 610. Ἐνή.

615. leg. ὑπ' [e Schol.]

623. leg. κηρύττω γε [sic MS.]

633. lege αἰτιος ὑμιν : cf. 641. [Ita Dawes. p. 254.]

636. leg. ἀπὸ τῶν πόλεων οἱ πρέσβεις [ita Porson. Praef. Hec. p. 48.]

638. fo. δὶ' ιου στεφάνους.

655. leg. καμαδεῖ vel—οῆ [ita Scaliger : at rectius Tyrwhitt. ἀρῆς ut edidit ELM. SL.]

659. Suid. in Παλαμᾶθαι habet πρὸς ταῦτ' οὐ, τι χρή et post ἀλῶ addit κακὰ πράσσων: nempe ex Tragico cuius hæc est parodia.

664. leg. Λακκατακύγων [sic MSS. S.] Photius in Lex. Λακκατάρατοι, οἱ ἄγαν κατάρατοι καὶ Λακκατακύγων, ἄγαν κατακύγων vid. Lys. 583. [ubi Bentl. λακκατάρατε pro παγκατάρατε.]

665. Schol. φλεγυγά.—670. lege ἡνίκ' ἄν. [sic MSS. 3.]
 671. ἀναχωκῶσι Suid. in Θασῖται.
 684. οὐδὲν ὁρῶντες Suid. in Ἡλύγη.
 690. Ex Schol. et Suid. in Λύζει videtur olim fuisse εἰτ' ἀλύζει.
 706. lege κάπεμορξέάμην, ἀπὸ τοῦ μόργυνυμα: alioqui decesset hic incrementum Aoristi. Hesych. Ἀπεμορξέάμην ex hoc loco. Suid. in "Ποτ'" ἔγα habet κάποι- et μονού χωκάμενον: at κάπεμ- et κοιμώμενον in Ἀπεμορξέάμην: sed MSS. ibi ut editum. [ἀπεμορξέάμην Scaliger et Porson P̄af. Hec. p. 26.]
 710. lege μὲν τὸ πρῶτον vel μέν γ' ἄν.
 Ibid. Inter Schol. post ἀσπερ additur Εὔαθλος e Suid. in Εὔαθλος et Schol. ad Vesp. 590.
 730. leg. Ἐπόθεν.—731. leg. ἀθλίω [ita ElMSL.]
 733. Olim volunt Bentl. ποτέχετον omisso ἐμὸν [sic ElMSL.] postea Ἀκούετε δῆ. [et sic Hermann. de Metr. p. 153.]
 737. lege ὑμέ γα.
 738. Suid. Ἄλλα στὶν ἡμῖν Μεγάρικα: at ἄλλ' ἐστὶν ἡμῖν in Μεγαρικα. lege Ἄλλ' ἐντι γ' ἀμὸν vel γὰρ ἐμὸν.
 739. Ald. φασῶ.
 741. δοξῆτ' omisso ἐξ Suid. in Σὺς et Τς. male.
 742. Ald. οἴκαδης. Vid. 779.—743. leg. λιμῶ. [ita ElMSL.]
 748. dele γε [sic R̄]
 754. lege vel Ἄλλα γ' vel Ἄλλ' ὄκκα.
 758. ΔΙ. non agnoscit Ald. [neque MSS.]
 764. leg. χοίρως [ita ElMSL.]
 768. Frob. ποδαρῆδ ἥστι. lege vel ποδαρῆ δὴ ὅστι vel ποδάρ' ἦδ' ἐστι.
 772. dele νῦν et sic Suid. in Θυμητίδων et Περιδοῦ ubi Θυμητίδων.
 777. leg. χοίριον: vid. 740. [ita Dorvill. ad Chait. p. 239. et MS.]
 778. leg. σιγᾶς [e Schol.]—788. χοῖρας Athen. ix. p. 374.
 790. leg. ταυτῶ [ita Brunck.]—792. leg. ἐσται [ita MS. Rav.]
 798. leg. κανὸν ἀνις γα: vid. 834.—799. fo. ἐσθίουσι.
 801. fo. ἐκών: κοὶ κοὶ. vel τράγις ἐγεβίθευς αὐτὸς ἀν κοὶ.
 802. δὲ Suid. in Φίβαλις.
 803. Ald. δέ: μον "fo. αὐτῷ": at totum versum uneis circumdedit Bentl. [quia Suid. in Φίβαλις citat 802, et 804. omisso 803.]
 813. τροφαλλίδης Suid. in Ηόσου: ut τριπηλίδης in sua serie.
 817. leg. ἐμαυτῶ [ita Brunck.]
 824. } dele { ME. } et leg. οἱ γαράνομοι. vid. 723 et 967. [Ita
 825. } dele { ΔΙ. { Brunck.]
 833. fo. οὖν.—835. Hesych. et Phot. Ηαίσιν—ἐσθίειν.
 836 et sqq. disponuntur in 4. systemata sex versuum.
 843. απ νεικῶν [i. e. νεικέων.]
 849. ἀει κεκαρμένος Suid. in Μοιχός. sed forte legend. ἀνακαρμένος.

851. *fo. τάχος.*
 855. *leg. ἐν τῷ γορᾶ [ita Brunck. vid. 728 et 848.]*
 874. *lege φιάσω—κολοιώς—τροχῶς κολύμβως [ita Brunck.]*
 879. *Ald. αἰελούρως.—883. [In Schol. χορὸν] *fo. καρῶν.**
*884. *fo. κήπαχάριτα* vid. 867.—889. *χρατίστην* Athen. p. 299. B.*
891. Ald. τέν', alii τέκ': leg. τίκν'.
908. μή: leg. μὴ στὶ [ita Kuster.]
907. leg. πολλᾶρ[ita Brunck.]
909. ἀλλὰ πᾶν κακὸν Suid. in Μιχέος.—912. δαῖ: leg. δέ.
*916. Θρυαλλίδα Suid. in Θρυαλλίς.—917. *fo. διὰ θρυαλλίδος.**
920. σίλφην Suid. in Θρυαλλίς: τίφην in Νεώρια. et sic Ald.
[933. et sqq. disponuntur in systemata: quae commemorentur non est necessis: melius ELMISLEIUS carmen antistrophicum esse videt.]
933. an iῶ [cui proxime accedit Ran. lῶν.]
971. εἶδες ὡ semel. Suid. in "Ανθηρα.
972. Suid. I. c. οἷον ἔχει σπεισάμενος: recte si legis οἱ' [et sic MS. B.]
977. Inter Schol. φίλτατ' Αγμόδιε: vid. Athen. p. 695.
Ibid. τὸ δὲ λάμπωνος: leg. τ. δ. τελαμῶνος: vid. Lys. 1299. et Athen. I. c. at λάμπωνος Suid. in Οὐδίποτε et in Πάροινος: ubi tacet Kuster.
985. τᾶδ' an δᾶδ'.
990. ξυναγάγῃ Suid. in Λιθίμων—997. dele ἐν [sic ELMISL.]
998. ἀλείφεσθαι Suid. in Νουμηνίᾳ, at ἀλείψασθαι in Λαείψας.
999. Ed. Frob. λεψ.
1016. dele γε. Διάκονος 2da longa. Vid. Av. 73, 4. et 889.
*1020. *fo. κάν πέντετες* [vid. 191.] Scal. κάς πεντ' ἔτη.*
1021. Ald. ἐπεργίβειν. Scal. ἐπεργίβην.
1023. τρισκακούμιμον Suid. in Αμπέχει.
*1024. *fo. ὄπερ* [sic MSS.]*
*1031. *lege τοῦ πιπτάλου:* vid. 1220. et Vesp. 1423. Suid. τοῦ Σπιττάλου in Σπίτταλος.*
1052. ἀλάβαστον Suid. in Αλαβαστοθήκας.
*1077. *leg. πλέονες* [sic ELMISL.]*
1090. στέφος Suid. in "Ιτριζ.—1093. τάχος Suid. I. c.
1098. οἵσε μοι Suid. in Περίδου.—1101. dele σύ.
1124. γυρόνωτον Plutarch. [comparat. Aristoph. et Menand. p. 853. C.]
1130. κελεύω] κελεύων B. [ita Bentl. at quid velit per istud B. nescio. scio tamen MSS. κελεύων habere.]
1145. Olim sic "fo. σεὶ δὲ αὖ," mox "δὲ longum ob & sequens." [vid. ad Nub. 543.]

1149. forte ψακάδα [e Schol.] sed repugnat Suid. in Ἀντιμάχου,
verum in Τευθίδης [et Ψέκας] habet ψεκάδα.
- Ibid. Inter Schol. καιρὸν: λέγε χορὸν e Suid. [ita Kuster.]
1150. dele τὸν αὐτὸν ποιότην [sic MSS.]—1162. λέγε καὶ θάτερον.
1164. βαδίζει Suid. in Ἡπίαλος. fo. βαδίζοι [ita Elmsl.] sed vid.
Schol. ad v. 1181. [scil. nominativus est pendens.]
1178. Suid. Παλινορού. λέγε παλινορούς [ita Elmsl.] immo Παλι-
νωρού ex Hesychio.
1199. Ad Schol. verba Θηλυδριῶδες καὶ κατεγγλωττισμένου ad-
scripsit Thesm. 198.
1200. λέγε καὶ τὸ μανδαλωτὸν αὖ. Suid. Μανδαλωτόν: [et sic
Elmsl.] sed ut editum in Περιπεταστόν.
1203. ίώ ίώ] τῶν. at Suid. in Συμφορᾶ ut editum.
1218. fo. κάγω γ' ὀπίσειν.
1220. λέγ. τοῦ [sic Ran.] vid. ad 1031.
1224. δδυρτή Suid. in Ὁδύρτη.
1226. λέγε ὡ πρέσβυ [e Schol. sic Ran.]
1228. ὡ ἀγένναδα. dele α [sic Scaliger et MSS.]
- Ibid. Inter Schol. “Vid. Schol. ad Av. 1762. et sic leg. Τύνελ-
λα. ‘Ω καλλίνικε χαῖρ’ ἀναξ Ἡράκλεος Αὐτός τε χώ Ιολαος αἰχμητὴ
δύο. Vid. Schol. Pind. Ol. ix. i.” [ita Elmsl.]
-

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

*De Vocibus Blitonis, sive Blitōs, et Blitomāmīa, de quo
Sensu primario vocum Mārōs, Māraīnō, ‘Fatuus, insul-
sus.’*

HESYCH. *βλίτον λάχαῖου εἶδος.* Lex. Reg. Ms. ap. Albert. *βλίτων* εἶδος λαχάῖου τινὲς δὲ βλίττον γράφουσι. Ap. Suid. habemus, *βλίτος*: εἶδος Βετάνης: nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. habet *βλίτος*, quod lexicographis est notandum: *βλίτος*; autem esse i. q. *βλίτον*, e Latina lingua appetet: Pallad. in Mart. tit. 9. sub fin. *Hoc mense blitus seritur solo qualicunque, sed culto.*

Aristoph. *Nub.* 1001. Br. *Tοῖς Ἰπποκράτους υἱόσιν εἴξει, καὶ σε καλοῦσι Βλιτομάμιαν.* Hermannus bene scribit *Βλιτομάμιαν*, (quod Phrynicus Σοφ. Προταρ. habet) et bene posteriorem hujus vocab. partem derivat, ut Phrynicus, a μάρμη, quod matrem significat: *βλιτομάμιας*: ἐπὶ ταν ἐκλευμένων οἰά τριψήρ συγκεῖ; αι μετὰ τὸ *βλίτον*, ὃ ἔστι λάχανον ἔκλιτον ἀνιστόν τε δριμύτητος, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μάρμη, ὃ σημαίνει μητῆρ ἐξ αὐν τούτων συγκιμένην σημαίνει τὸν ἐπὶ μητρὸς τροφῷ ἐξίτηλον γε ἴμειον. Quid sibi velit Phrynicus, patrum intelligimus. “Inepta sunt,” ut ait Brunckius, “quæ ad hoc verbum adnotat Schol. *βλιτομάμιαν* Perperam in meo Cod. *βλιττομάμιαν*: pejus ap. Suid. *βλιττομάμιαν* (quare Br. Suidæ *βλιτομάμιαν* pejus esse dicat, non videt Herm.) Egregie fallitur H. Steph. *Ind.*, ubi postulante metro potius legendum esse ait καλοσούσι τε οι βλιττομάμια: optime se habet Codd lectio: ultima in καλοῦσι producitur οι sequentem medium cum liquida. *Βλιτομάμια*, derivatur a *βλίτον*, *bilitum*, quod pleris genus est *omnium insipidissimum et fatuum*, unde *insulsi* et *inutiles blitei* appellantur. Plaut. *Truc.* iv. 1. *Blitea et lutea est meretrix, nisi que sapit in rino ad rem suam.* Gallos vocem suam, qua socordes inertesque homines *blittres*, *belitres*, appellant, hinc deduxisse, viris quibusdam eruditis creditum fuit. Sed verisimilius assertur etymon.”

Doctissimus Brunckius verba Schol. quæ exscripsit Suidas, non intellexit: *βλιτομάμιν μωρὸν*, τὸ γὰρ *βλίτον* μαρὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ λάχανον: immo adeo non sunt “inepta quæ ad h. v. adnotat Schol.,” ut Brunckius ipse cum Scholiasta idem sentiat: nam quod Schol. appellat μαρὸν λάχανον, id Brunckius vocat *insipidissimum et fatuum*. *Μωρὸν* enim proprie notat *id quod est insipidum*, vel *fatuum*, i. e. *sine sapore*. Lexicographi hanc propriam vim vocis minus percepunt. H. Steph. *Th. Gr. L. T. ii. p. 1664, D.*, qui hunc sensum non, ut debuerat, primarium fecit: “*Mωρὸς*,” inquit, “cujus gus-

tus est satius, sive insipidus, Diosc. iv. πίκαι γευσαμένω μωγαῖ, ubi quidam interpr. *radices gustu fatuo*; quidam, *radices sapore insipido*." Iterum de verbo μωράνεσθαι; p. 1666. C. "Pro *infatuari*, i. e. *fatuum*, seu *insipidum reddi*: ap. Matth. v. ἐὰν δὲ τὸ ἄλιτρο μωράνθῃ, εἰ τίνι ἀλισθήτεται; ubi vet. interpr. *vertit*, *Si sal evanuerit, in quo salietur?* Alii autem reddunt, *Si sal infatuatus fuerit*: redditur etiam, *si desipuerit*, item, *si insipidus factus fuerit*. Illud certe verbum *infatuatus* significatione convenit: si modo ap. Martialem (xiii. 13.) *betas fatuas exponere possumus insipidas*: Marcus pro μωρανθῇ habet ἀναλογογένηται: sequitur autem hoc μωρανθῇ eam nominis μωρός significationem, qua pro *fatuo*, seu *insipido* usurpari a Dioscoride, paulo ante docui." Galenus Expl. Vocc. Hippocr. Μωρανθέντα τὰ ἀναλογητα, ubi Franzius refert ad Procrh. p. 197. 53. et Couc. Præn. p. 429. 15. Non debuerat H. Steph. de vi τοῦ *fatuas*, i. e. *insipidas*, ap. Martialem dubitare, nam Martialis siepe vocabulo sic utitur: xiii. 10. "Ut *sapiant fatuæ fabrorum prandia betæ*, O quam sœpe petet vina piperque coquua!" X. 37. "Et *fatuam summa cœnare pelorida mensa*." XL. 32. "Hinc pistor *fatuas* facit placentas." Forcellinus, qui, ut nobis videtur, minus recte judicat "*fatuam* translate dici de cibis, qui *insipidi sunt*," et qui, ut Gesnerus quoque facit, unum tantum Martialis locum adducit, sc. eum, in quo occurunt verba *fatuæ betæ*, bene scribit: "Fortasse huc pertinet illud Varronis ap. Non. IV. n. 291. Quod Cal. Jun. et publice, et privatim *fatuam pultem* diles mactat, h. e. *sine sale*, et fortasse intelligit libum ex farre, et faba, quod eo ipso die Carnæ deæ offerri solitum, tradit Ovid. VI. Fast. 170." Servius in Virg. Georg. iii. 395. "Ipsum lac non sit *fatuum*, sed habeat *salis occultum saporem*," notante Wetstenio ad loc. Matth.

"Ut *fatuu* et pro *insipido* et pro *stulto* usurpatur, ita quoque *insulsus*, de quo Non. Marc. p. 501. (Gothofredi Auctt. L.L. ed. 1622) "Insulsum, proprie *fatuum*, sine sale: M. T. ad Cæsarem Juniores Epist. ii. Sed ita locutus insulse est, ut mirum Senatus convitum excepérat, et de Oratore II. (257. c. 54.), Sed qui ejus ratiō rationem quandam conati sunt, artemque tradere, sic *insulsi exstiterunt*, ut nihil aliud eorum, nisi ipsa *insulsitas irrideatur*. Ad etymologiam vocis alludit Quintil. Inst. VI. 9., cum scribit: *Balsum igitur erit, quod non erit insulsum: velut quoddam simplex orationis condimentum, quod sentitur latente iudicio velut palato, et citatque et a tedium defendit orationem*.

"Μωράνω," ut ait Schleusnerus, "proprie de rebus usurpatur, significat *fatuum*, *insipidum reddo*, *corrumpo*: passiv. μωράνομαι, *fatuns*, et *insipidus* fio, *corrumpor*, vim et vigorem amitto, a μωρός, *fatuns*, *insipidus*: ita dicitur de *sale* Matth. V. 13. Cf. Weigelii Exercitall. Medioo-pholol. Decad. V. Exerc. 4. p. 15. J. H.

Maii Obs. ss. III. p. 105." Iterum: "Μωρός, ut *fatuus* Martial. XIII. 13. *insipidus*, qui *saporem*, ~~tim~~, et *vigorem* *amisit*, Hippocr. de Dizeta II. 27. Text. 2. Dioscor. IV. 18. p. 122.; deinde, ut Hebr. לְפִתָּח (quod pr. *insulsum*, *insipidum*, Job. vi. 6. deinde vero *stultum* notat, v. c. *Thren.* ii. 4.) Lat. *fatuus*, Gallic. *fade*, et nostrum *abgeschmackt*—q. μῶρος, ex μή, non, et ὥπα, *cura*, qui nullius rei *cura tangitur*, vel quasi μὴ ὄφων, non *videns*, sc. *animo*, non *intelligens*." Mirum sane, Schleusnerum, doctissimum simul et acutissimum, qui tam bene de sensu primario hujus vocis præcepit, vulgarem sequi etymologiam, quæ huic primario sensui parum convenit. Nec hæc etymologia, nec altera ap. Eustath., qui vult μωρὸς dictum esse quasi μύρος, H. Stephano satis placet. Tertiam etymologiam affert Schneiderus in Lex.: μάρω, μαράω, μαραίνειν: sic μᾶλυς, μωλυρός contr. μωρός: ap. Hippocr. *Epid.* i. p. 364. μωλύμενα sunt κατὰ βραχὺ ἀπομαραίνομενα, ut Galenus vocem explanat: sed hæc etymologia nobis non placet, nec varii sensus vocum μωρός, et μᾶλυς (i. e. *tardus*, *hebes*, *indoctus*) inter se congruere vindentur. Μωρὸν esse *insipidum* ap. Hippocr., notavit J. C. Schwarzius *Comment. crit. et philol. L. Gr. N. F.* Lips. 1737. p. 931., et post eum Schleusnerus. Jam vero si *fatuus* et *insulsus* ap. Latifios, et לְפִתָּח ap. Hebræos usurpentur et pro *insipido*, et pro *stulto*, quid mirum μωρὸν eundem duplēcē sensum ap. Græcos habere? et si propria notione *fatuus*, et *insulsus*, et לְפִתָּח pro eo, *quod est sine sapore*, sumantur, quare dubitemus eundem primarium Gr. verbo μωρός, tribuere sensum, non videmus, præsertim cum e sensu *insipidi* facili transitu perveniamus ad sensum *stulti*.

Hermannus βλιτομάρμα est "is qui, infantis instar, matrem perpetuo vocantis, simplex et stolidus est: similiter μαμμάκυοι Ran. 990."

Thetford, Oct. 6th, 1815.

E. H. BARKER.

**AN ANSWER TO
A LATE BOOK**

*Written against the Learned and Reverend Dr. Bentley,
relating to some Manuscript Notes on Callimachus.*

**TOGETHER WITH AN EXAMINATION OF MR. BENNET'S
APPENDIX TO THE SAID BOOK.**

LONDON : PRINTED IN THE YEAR, 1690.

No. VI.—*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 145.*

*To the Author of the Remarks upon Dr. Bentley's Fragments
of Callimachus.*

AND that Supplement of yours must not be passed over in silence. Then might you call me a partial writer indeed, if I took no notice of your supplement. This supplement of yours you have set forth in a place by itself; and, the more effectually to draw the reader's eye upon it, marked it out into thirteen capital figures. You introduce it thus.

V. I expected, when I looked on the last beautiful edition of Callimachus, to have found every little passage of the ancient writers, wherein but his name was mentioned, gathered to my hands by Dr. Bentley.

W. Then you could not but have expected to have found in Dr. Bentley all those quotations out of the ancient writers which are in Mr. Stanley's MS. whether ever he had seen that MS. or not. Tis fate; the Dr. shall be acquitted by the same mouth that accuses him.

V. But I have met with a few, which, I presume, he either had not seen or forgotten.

W. A few.

V. And because I am persuaded it will not disserve the learned world, I shall insert them.

W. Sc. By way of supplement to the former editions of Callimachus. For otherwise, what service could it be to the learned world? And so you explain yourself when upon Num. 12. you expressly say (p. 49.) that that epigram, *Quenam hæc forma Dei, &c.* was (you thought) omitted in the late edition. Here therefore we may expect to see the whole extent of your reading, and what services the learned world may procure itself from your pen. I shall take them one by one in order as they lie.

Num. 1. *Suidas v. Κωλάς, Ναός ἐστι τῆς Ἀφροδίτης, &c.* formerly cited at length.

W. Supra.

V. Num. 2. v. Καμήρα. Καμῆρα καὶ οἱ γειτόνες, &c. in the same page.

W. In the same page.

V. Κάππα Mr. B. p. 245.

W. Κάππα supra.

V. Num. 3. Natalis Comes's citation out of Callimachus's Hecate, accounted for already.

W. I'll have nothing to do with Natalis Comes.

But why should I be so angry, will you ask me, with Natalis Comes? [p. 50, 51.] That Italian critick was a famous man in his generation, and had read nobody knows how many MSS. [p. 45.]

I'll tell you, Sir: there was a certain Italian critick, a man of vast learning indeed, but withal so horrible unmannerly, that the world hated and despised him at the same time that it was profiting by him; one Joseph Scaliger. [v. Mr. B. p. 225. confer cum Dr. B's Answ. Praef. p. 100.] And he hath given me such an idea of this Italian critick of yours, that makes me apt (at first sight) to think the worse of any book (yours I except) wherein I do but meet with so much as the name of this Natalis Comes. 'Tis in one of his letters to Sethus Calvisius, where he tells that great astronomer with what satisfaction all men of learning received that excellent book, his chronology. [Scaliger Ep. 309.] Upon which he immediately adit... Qui unum, ac cum illis ego, à te pe.unt, ut scriptorum quorundam minorum gentium mentione, qualis est Natalis Comes, homo futilissimus, abstineas. Dolet enim magnis viris illos pannos tuæ purpuræ assui: Tu hæc in secundâ editione curabis. That it grieved all men of learning to see the name of so wretched a trifler as Natalis Comes standing in so excellent a book as Calvisius his chronology, and therefore Scaliger begs of him, that in the next edition he would strike him out: which accordingly was done. This passage of Scaliger, Mausacus, in his dissert. critic. (referr'd to more than once before) repeats, and expresses himself even to a passion upon it. It raised an indignation in him, that there should be found men in the world so weak as to pretend to establish any thing upon the credit of such beggarly scribblers as Natalis Comes, and set up for criticks and authors by stuffing out their books with such borrowed authorities. So that whether the Dr. had never seen this passage in Natalis Comes, or whether he had forgotten it, or whether (which is more likely) he neglected it, I am not able to determine: but that this Natalis Comes is an author with whom you are extremely well acquainted, is a plain case. There's not any one name in your whole book comes so often over as Natalis Comes. Dr. Bentley takes his Fragment, n. 110. from the Etymologicou (Nicas some call him —— turn to it, reader, in the vindicator's book, p. 43, 44. 'Tis a learned parenthesis) but Natalis Comes had published a larger fragment: Dr. Bentley takes after Casaubon's lection; [p. 45.] but Natalis Comes gives them more correct, and translates them better: and who knows what MSS. Natalis Comes may have seen? [p. 50.] Natalis Comes gives another epigram too as from Callimachus, and though I know not, whether that Italian author was critick enough to determine the controversie; [what controversie?] yet Dr. Ben-

they might have been so fair as to have mentioned him. Natalis Comes hath given us a handsome commentary upon the fragment, n. 209. int. Bentleian. [p. 71.] But Dr. Bentley transcribes it (and that but abruptly) from the Scholiast upon Sophocles : and that book indeed, the Scholiast upon Sophocles, the Dr. had consulted : but as for Natalis Comes, one knows not whether Dr. Bentley hath ever so much as seen that Italian critick. And here again, Num. 3. we have Natalis Comes : and Num. 11. Natalis Comes again. And may not a man say of this Natalis, your darling author : this Natalis Comes, Sir, is an erranter pedant than Dion Chrysostom himself. [Mr. B. p. 26. confer cum Dr. B.'s Answ. p. 5, 6.] But,

Pro captu lectoris habent sua fata libelli.

The sense of which words I find happily alluded to in a late excellent poem.

But each vile Scribler's happy on this score,
He'll find some Drancus still to read him o'er. [Dispensary.]

After Natalis Comes, your next darling author is Lactantius Placidus. In p. 36. we have had Lactantius, or (as you well observe) Lutatius Placidus; in p. 38, 39. You have run on score with the same Lactantius Placidus for a considerable parcel of mistakes of the first size. [Supr.] Here Num. 4. you are in with your Lactantius again, and Num. 9. you will even account with him, making as many mistakes, and as foul ones upon Lactantius, as Lactantius had before made for you.

V. Num. 4. Lactantius Placidus, &c.

W. Enjoy it. The other three you are beholden to your MS. for. For though I doubt not, but that Mr. Stanley had read all Suidas over, yet for Mr. Stanley's vindicator I cannot make out the like evidence. Lactantius Placidus is a critick so stooping towards your height, that I am apt to believe you may have read him. And therefore this Num. 4. (though I think I could dispossess you of it) yet I am willing to let pass for your own.

But here (as you cannot forbear him) you occasionally bring in another remark upon the Dr. which should indeed have been referred to the class of Transportations, supr.

V. To that book of Callimachus, entitled, *Kτίσεις Νήσων καὶ πόλεων*, *καὶ μετωργασται*; that is, the foundation of cities and Islands, and the change of their names : I would also refer all those passages in Pliny, cited by Dr. Bentley, n. 392, 393, 394, 395, 397. in which there is an express mention of the change of the names of those places. [p. 82.]

W. In not one of these passages out of Pliny is there any such express mention. There is indeed express mention of the names of several places and people, and sometimes of several names of the same places : but not of the *μετωργασται*, the change of those names. That which comes the nearest to your purpose, is n. 397. *Eām (Samothrācen) Callimachus antiquo nomine Dardaniam vocat*. But to have answer'd your design, it should have been, antiquo nomine (or rather *antiquitūs*) Dardaniam vocatam (fuisse) tradit. Express mention, you say, of the change of those names. But, pray, Sir, what express mention of the change of the names do you find in this fragment, n. 393. *inter Corcyram et Illyricum Melita*; unde catulos Melitos appellari

Callimachus auctor est. Here is, you say, express mention of the change of the names. Were the Melitæi therefore formerly called Catuli, or the Catuli, Melitæi? For the one or the other of these you must mean. There were, Sir, of old a certain race of lap-dogs called Catuli Melitæi; and this name, saith Callimachus, was given them from the island Melita; that is, from this island Melita lying near Coreyra (Corfu:) not that other island of the same name lying near Sicily, now called Malta. And this is all that Pliny means. But by one dash of your pen are a whole nation of islanders metamorphosed into a breed of lap-dogs. A man that was minded to deal less tenderly with you than I am, would not have parted with this choice piece of lap-dog criticism for two or three pages together. But I cannot imagine you to be so wretchedly ignorant, as to have taken the Catuli Melitæi for a people. [Mr. B. p. 45.] No, certainly, Sir, you are a greater scholar than so. This was put down only to carry on the humour of contradicting Dr. Bentley. But as you have got nothing by it hitherto, let me advise you to give it over.

V. I am of opinion that the fragment n. 399. may belong to Callimachus the statuary. [p. 83.]

W. Here you are at it again; Dr. Bentley must be corrected. There can no other reason in the world be given for any man's being of that opinion, but because that fragment relates to a statue. Pliny tells us a story of a certain person, that had, during his life-time two statues, erected to him, both of which statues, though standing in places far distant the one from the other (the one in Italy, the other in Greece) were struck with lightning on the same day. This, saith Pliny, Callimachus looked upon as next to a prodigy. And might not Callimachus the poet wonder at so strange an accident as well as Callimachus the statuary? But however this serves to expose the Dr. who (with Harduin) was so injudicious as to refer this passage to Callimachus the poet.

V. Num. 5. A quotation out of Diomedes Grammaticus.

Num. 6. The like out of Atil. Fortunatianus de Priapeio metro.

W. The only discovery with which you have in these two numbers obliged the learned world is, that as among the Romans, Propertius, Tibullus, and Gallus wrote in elegiac versè: so before them did Callimachus and Euphorion among the Greeks. And that Callimachus in his epigrams had, as to the choice of his metre, some peculiarities of his own ('tis not said what) as had also Bacchilides, and some other poets, theirs. And this is one of those discoveries omitted by Dr. Bentley: [p. 49.] the bringing of which to light, you are persuaded is no disservice to the learned world. Certainly so, Sir, no disservice. Your quotation of Atil. Fortunatianus is out of Putschius his *Grammatici Veteres*, p. 2676. In the Dr.'s answer to your honourable patron, p. 227. I find him within three pages of you in the same Atil. Fortunatianus, sc. on p. 2679. de Saturnio versu. Which passage in the Dr. with the occasion of his producing it, p. 226. I recommend to the perusal of the inquisitive reader. So lucky are you all along in your memorandums, though I take notice of but few of them.

V. Num. 7. Atilius Fortunatianus, p. 268^a, de Saturnio versu.

W. Much to the same purpose as the two former, only with this difference, that as in them you did no disservice to the learned world, so in this you do no service: this very passage being printed in Grævius's Callimachus, and placed by Spanheim, where it should be, amongst the Testimonia, p. 302.

V. Num. 8. A quotation out of Cæcilius Minutianus Apuleius from Cælius Rhodiginus.

W. In the fore-mentioned Salvagnius Boessius his Prolegomena, p. 16, which our vindicator, without naming his benefactor, hath confidently made his own. But those prolegomena of Salvagnius Boessius Dr. Bentley hath read, and therefore cannot but have seen this quotation. [Supra.] 'Tis a known story, and produced by the Dr. over and over, (p. 345.) and that from far more certain authorities than that unknown Cæcil. Minutianus Apuleius, upon whom Salvagnius sets this mark; *Quin nondum lucem vidit, unique Cœlio Rhodigino notus fuit.*

V. Num. 9. Lactantius Placidus.

Your darling author Lactantius Placidus. There was no occasion in the world for your exposing your self here. In the first place you do not contradict Dr. Bentley. In the next, when you were only making a supplement to Callimachus, you should have let those things alone which were already done to your hand. The passage here produced is printed with a large commentary upon it, by Spanheim in his volume of learned observations upon this author, p. 571, 572. And a little modesty might have taught you not to have meddled with a subject before exhausted by so masterly a pen. But to do you justice, I verily believe, you did not know of Mr. Spanheim's having said any thing to it.

V. Were I allow'd to play the bold critick, I would for Arcados read Argivi, (for Tydeus, the father of Diomedes — —, [p. 86.]

W. Bold critick! Most properly spoken, and since 'tis an epithet of your own chusing, may it be your character: the bold critick. Such a number of gross absurdities crowded into the compass of so few lines (one short parenthesis) I defie any man to show me in any book in the whole world again. And they are all your own: not one of them here, as before in the case of Brauchades Apollo, borrowed from Lactantius Placidus. [Supr.] In the first place, Sir, spolium signifies the spoils (as the armour, and badges of honour) taken from off the body of an enemy slain in open fight; as in Virgil, *Aectoris Aurunci Spolium*; and not the armour worn by a man while living. So that according to your correction of the poet, this Diomedes the son of Tydeus must have been (as indeed afterward he was) a famous warriour, must have perform'd all his exploits, must have been slain in the wars; and all this long before he was born; nay, he must, after he was slain, and before he was begotten, have danc'd in armour at his father's wedding. For 2dly, Sir, if you had took time to look into the author upon whom you were commenting, you would have found that these words were timed at Tydeus his marriage with the mother of Diomedes. And 3dly, if you had look'd into any of your poetical dictionaries, you would have found

that there were two Diomedes, that is, Diomedes the Thracian, slain by Hercules, and this Argian Diomedes the son of Tydenus; and that 'twas the Thracian Diomedes, who was so famous for his man-eating, chimney-nos'd horses. [Impius humano viscere pavit equos, Ovid. Et Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem, Lucret.] And consequent from these premises you will find; 1st, That your Argos *irwiforos* is nothing at all to the purpose. 2ndly, That Euhippus was substantial flesh and blood, and not a mere noun adjective. And 3dly, From hence may the reader take this information, that a book may have a great many Greek and Latin words in it, and bear a mighty show of learning, though written by a man that understands nothing of the matter he is writing upon; and withal, that some of the pages written against Dr. Bentley are of this kind.

V. Manuscript—p. 87.

W. Stuff!

V. Num. 10. A quotation out of Photius.

W. A bare mention of the name of Callimachus with something of a censure pass'd upon him with several other writers in a lump.

V. Num. 11. A choice epigram out of Natalis Comes.

W. I'll have nothing to do with Natalis Comes.

V. Num. 12. An Epigram out of the collection of the epigrammata veterum with this title.

Callimachi

Imagini inscriptum Jovis.

Quænam hæc forma Dei? cur versa est? Fulgura lucis
Divinae non fert debilis hæc acies, &c.

Which epigram, (p. 49.) if I am not mistaken, the late editors of Callimachus have not mentioned.

W. You are mistaken, Sir. 'Tis in both the last edition of Graevius's, and in the edition last before that of Dacier; in both of them inter testimonia veterum. Oh shamefull! Not so much as turn'd over the very first leaves of the book you were making your comments upon!

V. Num. 13. A citation out of Malela.

W. Omitted by the Dr. (I confidently presume) for the same reason, as were those out of Natalis Comes.

V. The learned editor of that historian for Etesiis reads Aëtiis.

W. The learned editor of that historian saith not a word of the matter.

V. Perhaps it should be ἀγῶσιν.

W. An easie correction of Ερησίος into ἀγῶσιν. For there be two of the same letters in both words, σ. i. And, besides what have the Etesian winds to do with the racing-chariots? Did those chariots go with sails? vide loc. Malel. p. 221.

V. Callimachus wrote of winds, and therefore perhaps the true reading is in the text, and should be translated de Etesiis.

W. What need therefore of such a forced correction. περὶ ἀνέμων we know Callimachus wrote, but I never yet heard of any book of his entitled, Ερήσια.

V. And 'tis not altogether improbable, (but) that Suidas might mention his Αἴρια, if a small correction be allowed, and instead of τὸν δὲ

εἰροῦ βιβλίων ἐστὶ καὶ τὰῦτα, we read ἐστὶ καὶ Αἴρια, 'Ιοῦς'Αφίξις, &c.
But this opinion wants the countenance of a manuscript.

W. There was no manner of occasion for this learning of yours in this place. You'll never meet with any such thing in a MS. Or if you do, I'll venture to tell you before-hand, that MS. is faulty. He that hath the least gust of the Greek language will tell you, that the *καὶ* and the *τὰῦτα* cannot here be parted. But somewhat you must be a doing. A critick without his corrections, editions, and MSS. is like a Beau without his wig, vide Mr. B. p. 146. ΠΩΤΗΡΙΩΝ ΘΗΡΑΚΛΕΙΩΝ, and Dr. B.'s answer, p. 113.

* And here ends your supplement, upon which let us now cast up accounts, and see how deeply the learned world stands indebted to you.

This collection of yours, as you call it, consists of thirteen capital figures; [p. 88.] of which Num. 1, 2, transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. are somewhat to the purpose, and will, 'tis likely, be inserted in the next impression of Callimachus. 3, 7, 9, 12, printed in the last edition. 4, 5, 6, 10. a bare mention of the name of Callimachus. The epigram of 11. no more Callimachus's than your own. 8, 13. the substance of them both in the Dr.'s collection over and over. But as for those indifferent names which you have tack'd to them, Dr. Bentley scorn'd to make use of such authorities. So that, Sir, not to flatter you, the service you have done to the learned world by presenting it with this your supplement is just none at all: or the very utmost you can pretend to, is the having transcribed from Mr. Stanley's MS. the two quotations out of Suidas. But as for those usefull and accurate observations which you have added, as that of the Catuli Melitæi, and Diomedes's his armour, they are purely your own. And if Mr. Graevius, or any one else shall think fit to insert them in the next impression of Callimachus's Works, 'tis pity but that the world should be inform'd to whom it is obliged for them. [p. 74.] In the mean time, I have not been wanting in my endeavours to blazon your atchievements, and make the learned world take notice of them.

I have now performed all that, as far as you are concerned in it, my title page promises. For upon the former part of your book I had once designed a separate consideration. But I am weary of my work, and, I fassie, both your self and the reader think it high time for me to have done with you. Yet since it might look somewhat suspiciously to take no manner of notice of it, I shall, with all the brevity imaginable, bestow upon it a cursory reflection or two.

That former part of your book contains in it a most grievous accusation. Dr. Bentley's injustice and inhumanity to those authors who have written before him. Upon which I cannot but in the first place observe to the reader, that had one designed to have written a panegyrick upon the Dr., one could not have pitch'd upon a more proper subject for it, than what this man makes choice of for matter of reproach against him: all this injustice and inhumanity of the Dr. to those authors who have written before him terminating in this point; that Dr. Bentley hath observed some mistakes that have drop'd from the pens of several great men, who have written before him, and corrected them: a service for which he hath received the publick acknowledgment of per-

sons altogether as considerable in the commonwealth of learning, as any of the retainers to the half-moon club. But if the Dr. doth (as indeed he pretty often doth) disagree from the opinions of those great men, who have written before him, it is; though sometimes with the assurance of a man that knows what he is speaking of, yet always, with a due respect and deference to the worth of the persons from whom he dissents. But let us proceed to particulars.

V. Dr. Bentley calls Æmilius Portus, hominum futilissimum, the greatest of Triflers, ep. ad fin. Mal. p. 51. [p. 7.]

W. Æmilius Portus was but a puny critick, and to persons of his character there is no epithet oftner apply'd, than that of futilissimus. We have had it once before, supr. [Vide quæ de Æmilio Porto Pearsonus in Prolegom. ad Hierocl. Æmilius Portus, qui Suidam aded infeliciter transtulit, &c.]

V. Nor can Gerard Vossius, and Johnsius escape being treated by him with the like language. [Ibid.]

W. 'Tis a most notorious falsehood.

V. Who suffer'd themselves to be led into an error through their ignorance. [Ibid.]

W. In errorem inscii inciderant, D. B. ep. p. 51. The word inscii, here is to be translated unwarily, incogitantly, not ignorantly. And but that these great men were guilty of a strange incogitancy as to the matter the Dr. was speaking of, is a thing which cannot be deny'd, vide locum. You must learn to construe a piece of Latin, before you write another book against Dr. Bentley.

V. The same most learned Vossius he severely arraigns in another place of committing a great mistake without consideration and judgment. [Ibid.]

W. You misconstrue the Dr. again, and turn his words to a sense directly contrary to what they intend, Dr. B. ep. p. 83. non certo judicio, sed inconsideratè, præterque morem egisse videtur. The sense of the Dr.'s words is plainly this, that though Vossius had written the name Malela without an s, yet 'twas not his certum judicium, not his own judgment, or his own standing opinion, that it ought always to be so written; for that his own practice contradicted: but he wrote it so, inconsideratè, præterque morem, inaccurately, incuriously, or (if you will have it so) inconsiderately; præterque morem, and contrary to his usual practice. For the whole stress of the Dr.'s argument is, that it was not Vossius's his standing opinion, that the name Malela ought to be written without an s, and consequently, that his writing it so, could not be through ignorance, or mistake, or for want of judgment; but purely either through inadvertency, or rather with a contented unexactness in compliance with some other authors who had used that way of writing it. So that you here charge the Dr. with charging Vossius with want of judgment, when the Dr. is arguing directly the contrary, and discharging him from that suspicion. Here's justice and judgment joyn'd together!

V. He speaks of the most learned man of the later Greeks, Leo Allatius, as if he were [a brute] not so much a man, as a composition of ill-nature and envy. [p. 8.]

W. The flourish of [a brute] is of your own making. The Dr. allows him the title of eruditissimus, ep. p. 50. As for the other part of his character, ep. p. 51. See how, after Bochart, the learned Dr. Th. Smith speaks of Leo Allatius in his *Narratio de vita, &c.* Cyrilli Lucarii; as in many other places, so particularly, p. 113. Leo Allatius—suspectae fidei testis, et ad convitiandum propensissimus. An unlucky quality, Sir, especially where there's no good one (which was not Allatius's case) to counterbalance for it.

V. He endeavours to prove Erasmus, Scaliger, and Grotius, men of no palate in matters of learning; or fools. [*Ibid.*]

W. A most notorious falsehood.

V. And accuses them of a most foul error.

W. But 'tis a most foul error in you to say so. He accuses not them of a most foul error, but the copies of Plutarch of a very faulty lection, which he wonders indeed none of those great men should have observed. Here follows your own correction of the Dr.'s correction. 'Tis like all the other things that are your own. You don't understand what the Dr.'s at, Sir, Μονσκών διδάσκει. The Dr.'s criticism runs more upon the διδάσκει than the Μονσκών. And therefore your marginal learning is (like every thing else you write) nothing to the purpose.

V. He allows not Florus Christianus, Scaliger, or any other of the moderns to have understood the true measures of an anapæstic verse. [*p. 9.*]

W. Of which presumption Mr. Boyle long before your self had accused the Dr. and in a much livelier manner; and before your book came out had received the Dr.'s answer to it. Mr. B. p. 159. Dr. B's answer, p. 132. et seqq. Is not the republishing baffled objections without taking a syllable notice of the answer which had been before given to them, a piece of impertinence?

V. He speaks very coarsely of Lilius Gyraldus, and Monsieur Ménage. [*p. 10.*]

W. 'Tis false. He never speaks of them otherwise than very respectfully.

V. He takes occasion frequently to quarrel with, and correct Isaac Casaubon. [*Ibid.*]

W. That he quarrels with Isaac Casaubon is falsely spoken. 'Tis true, Dr. Bentley hath observed that great man to have made (as the greatest of men have done) some mistakes; and some of them he takes occasion to correct; but this is not quarrelling with him. Dr. Bentley admires Isaac Casaubon, and never speaks of him but in terms of respect.

V. He censures the commentators upon Pliny. [*Ibid.*]

W. The worst you can make of his censure upon the commentators upon Pliny is, that they were learned men, but not omniscient. He takes notice of a particular passage in that author of which the commentators had fail'd to give a right explication, but saith he, εἰς ἀνὴρ οὐ μάρτυς δρᾶ, No man seeth all things. A severe ceusure!

V. He condemns Meursius of Ignorance. [*Ibid.*]

W. 'Tis false. The Dr. bath indeed, p. 40. these words concerning Meursius, ΙΙορυμ versuum ignoracione tota yia erravit Joannes Meur-

sius. The meaning of which is this: Julius Pollux, l. 7. c. 33, produces upon a certain occasion the authority of that ancient comic poet Eubulus, and gives it in Eubulus his own words. That quotation being written in Iambic verse (a sort of metre next to prose) and having nothing in it of a poetical air (as containing only a catalogue of names) and standing in Pollux continued with the rest of the text; Meursius mistakes it for the words of Pollux himself, and not of the author whose name Pollux cites to it: and horum versum ignoratione, ~~not~~ taking this quotation for prose, whereas indeed it was verse; and taking it for the words of Pollux, whereas they were indeed Eubulus's; upon this mistake, totū viā erravit, he was quite out in his explication of that passage. But that, Sir, was a mistake (as any one that shall consult the place will see) more easily committed than corrected. And Dr. Bentley's taking notice of it was no condemning Meursius of ignorance. Show me where in any of his writings, Dr. Bentley calls Meursius an ignorant man, and I'll retract every word I have spoken on his behalf. Sir, I must tell you again, that before you write any more critical books, you must understand Latin a little better, and learn to translate properly.

V. He condemns Quintilian too: [Ibid.] as if Quintilian did not know the true reading of a word in Cicero, as well as Dr. Bentley. But I thought Quintilian a creditable authority.

W. Credible, Sir, you mean. But I have mended your form for you upon this article. What you speak of is this passage in Tully, *De inventione, hujus constitutionis Hermagoras inventor esse existimatur.* And ibid. Quod si magnam in his Hermagoras habuisse facultatem. In both these places Quintilian reads it Hermagora. I dare say, the ingenious Mr. Boyle, who, 'tis plain, by his stile, hath a musical ear; after all which (rather than lose a flourish) he hath said upon the matter, is on the Dr.'s side against Quintilian. With the Dr. stand all the MSS. and so would any man that hath aures non asininas. But I believe, as to this affair, you are sincere, and do think the Dr. too presumptuous.

V. Nay, the Dr. saith, that though Tully himself should affirm he had written so; yet the Dr. would not believe Tully himself. No, Dr. Bentley would not submit to Tully himself. Tully the master of eloquence and standard of good language.

W. 'Tis true the Dr. doth say, (p. 80.) *Ego verò Ciceronem ita scripsisse ne ipsi quidem Ciceroni affirmanti crediderim.* Bold words, I confess. But, Sir, you must allow the Dr. to rhetoricate now and then. I have known a whole book, as large as yours and mine put together, made up of nothing but rhetorifications; and yet it took very well and turn'd to better account to the bookseller, than the best that ever he printed.

V. He calls Malela a mule. [p. 11.]

W. Nay the Dr. is very rude to Malela, that's the truth on't. [V. D. D. H. Hodii, Prolegom. in Malel.] Make a collection, Sir, of the Dr.'s complements upon his author Malela, and print them by way of a second appendix to the next edition of your book. You'll expose him most terribly. *Amabo te, Syriacæ; serione haec an joco? Quæ te enim larvæ atque intemperie agitant cum hac*

scriberes? ποῦ τοι φένες ἐγρέπανται; Muli sunt ista, non hominis—
Os hominis! Oh hominis stuporem! ab istâ pecude, &c. These are
the Dr.'s civilities to the author of the foregoing papers. But as for
your own civilities, Sir, in the following part of the same page (11.) I
leave them to be fairly divided between yourself and your friends.

V. He indites and arraigns the reverend Justin Martyr, Clemens
Alexandrinus, Eusebius, Theodore, and Athenagoras of forgery. [p.
12, 16.]

W. 'Tis a most notorious falsehood.

V. He flies higher and brings the rational and learned St. Paul un-
der his pounces. [p. 17.]

W. Very clumsily express'd, Sir. Dr. Bentley is not the first man
that hath offered at a conjectural emendation of the text of the New
Testament. I hope, Sir, though you talk so much of Scripture, Fa-
thers, and Councils; yet you are no clergyman. I should be very sorry
to hear, that a man who takes such delight in reviling his betters be-
longs to the gown.

V. He falls foul upon his most beloved friend Dr. Hody, exposing
his exposition of the Orphic Ericapæus with an air peculiar to himself.
[p. 23.]

W. The reverend and learned Dr. Hody is Dr. Bentley's most be-
loved friend. Amicissimus noster atque eruditissimus Hodius are the
Dr.'s own words, ep. p. 1. to which he adds p. 93. cui multum olim de-
debit historia Ecclesiastica.

But what a strange thing is this! That a man should set up for a
critick and censor of other men's works, without having ever read so
much as the very title-page of the book upon which he is making his
reflections. Sir, if you had but read so much as the title-page to Ma-
lela's chronology (as 'tis very plain Latin, I believe you could have con-
strued it) you would have found, that Dr. Hody was no more concern-
ed in this exposition of the Orphic Ericapæus than your self. The
title-page of that book bears, JOANNIS ANTIOCHENI, &c. cum inter-
pret. et Notis EDM. CHILMEADI—Premittitur dissertatio de authore
per HUMFREDUM HODIUM. Dr. Hody, you see, Sir, was neither the
interpreter nor commentator upon that book, but only the editor, and
writer of the dissertation concerning the author. And yet this same
most horrible blunder you have over again, p. 89. Or if you had
turned to the place it self that you are speaking of, Malel. chronogr. p.
90. you would have found that this exposition, as it was not Dr. Hody's,
so neither was it Mr. Chilmead's, but Mr. J. Gregory's, taken out of his
miscellaneous tracts published in English 4to. p. 147. Here's a critick for
you, as well read in what he has not seen, as in what he has.

V. Despising the author as well as the criticism with an, it is not my
province to trample on what lies prostrate at my feet.

W. But τοῖς κειμένοις ἐτρέμαζεν, is, mortuis insilire, Sir. To trample
on those that lie prostrate, as dead men in their graves, nobis vanquish'd
enemies at the feet of the conqueror. You must learn to construe
Greek and Latin, Sir, before you write any more books in criticism. Yet
even did this man think himself good enough to undertake Dr. Bentley.

Observe it, reader, and consider the consequence: when once Ban-

ter hath broke in upon a man's reputation, how securely ignorance will follow its leader.

I have done with you, Sir. And I think there is not one single article advanced against the Dr. throughout your whole Book, of which I have not given a fair account. Or if some little things may have escaped me, I promise you to give them, upon demand, the regard they shall deserve. As for what I have written, some few little odd exceptions you may make to here and there a particular passage: I saw them, and I passed them over; I was willing to leave you here and there a cavilling gap, an 'twere but on purpose to draw you on, and lay before you the temptation of exposing yourself to fresh disgraces. But take my advice, Sir, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*: Return your sword into its scabbard, and let's hear no more of you. You are not a person made for the humbling of Dr. Bentley. You have not the way of doing these things; the style, the wit, and the delicate turn: nothing in you but blunt confidence. Your friends (if you have any that will deal freely with you) will tell you the same.

One word to the postscript, and I have done. That that postscript is not of your own writing, I have before told you, I am certain. My reason for it is, because 'tis written in English, in a style and language that a man may understand it. Be the author of it who he will; all that I shall say to him is this: That since he hath so officiously made all the malice and ignorance of your book his own: all that is said to you let him take to himself.

I had designed, in imitation of your honourable patron's charitable instructions to Dr. Bentley, to have concluded my address to you also with two or three articles of advice. But I am afraid 'twould be lost labour. And besides, several hints of this nature you will find loosely scattered abroad in the foregoing papers, which you may easily draw together, and make what use of them you please. One thing let me most seriously and importunately beg of you, which is this: If you are resolved still to go on writing in this kind, let the Bible alone. For in good earnest, 'tis a most scandalous thing, to see a man so gravely quoting texts of Scripture, when he is upon so unchristian a work as is that of bearing false witness against his neighbour. I am,

Sir,

Your unknown, &c.

NOTICE OF

A HEBREW, LATIN, AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY.
By JOS. SAMUEL C. F. FREY. To be compiled in 12
Parts. Pr. 8s. small paper, 12s. royal, per part:

THERE perhaps never was a time, during the promulgation of Christianity, when there was so urgent a necessity for the am-

NO. XXIV.

CL. JL.

VOL. XII.

2 C

provement of Hebrew literature, as that in which we live. Infidelity, like a mighty flood, has attempted to sweep into oblivion the truths of the sacred scriptures, and to substitute the empty Mythology of the Greeks, and other pagan nations. Were we to inquire into the cause of this serious dereliction, we should find that it arose from a complete ignorance of the sacred language. Governments, as has been judiciously remarked by one of your correspondents, have not made the Hebrew, so necessary for a true understanding of the scriptures, a qualification for those whose business it is to officiate at the altar. This omission has been most severely felt by all ranks of professing Christians, during the last twenty five years: for the flagrant errors in all the European translations have caused the sacred volume to be neglected, first by intelligent men, and lastly by the lower orders of society.

It must therefore give every good man much pleasure, to see such a display of ability for the elucidation of the scriptures, as has not only made its appearance in the *Classical Journal*, but also in other publications. And it is a high gratification, that valuable works to aid the great cause of eternal truth are making their appearance in various directions.

The first part of this work contains an Alphabetical Vocabulary of all the Hebrew words, in all their variations, used in the Old Testament.

Second, All the Chaldee words in the Bible.

Third, A Complete catalogue of all the proper names. The pronunciation of these names is not according to the rules of any grammar, but as they are used in scripture.

Fourth, The roots are followed by all the significations in which they, or any branches of the verbs, are respectively used.

Fifth, To the Derivatives are annexed the significations appropriate to each.

Sixth, Words derived from obsolete roots, and the precise significations of which are doubtful, are accompanied with the different senses in which they are understood by the most learned critics.

Seventh, For the names of plants, animals, &c. advantage has been taken of the information of the best Critics, Naturalists, and travellers.

Eighth, To assist the student in writing exercises, the author has added a copious Vocabulary of English words, and another of Latin words, with the Hebrew words corresponding, but without prefixes, suffixes, and vowels; to avoid unnecessary extent and expense.

The student who has made sufficient progress in Hebrew to

write exercises, or to translate into it, either from the English, or Latin, will be sufficiently acquainted with the manner of forming the different inflections of the verb, and with the varieties of the nouns, to know where to look in the former part of the Dictionary, where he will find the precise form of the word which he may want, with the proper serviles and vowels. For example he wants, *his words*,—seek for *word*, and you find opposite to it *words*. As there is no prefix wanted, seek in the preceding part for *his*, and you will find *הבריך* *his words*. This process pursued for a little while, will increase his familiarity with the structure of the language, and with the words which it contains.

It is observable, the author has given the public a paper, worthy of the work—and the typographical execution does him the utmost credit. A new and elegant portrait of the author will be given gratis to the subscribers.

It is understood that Mr. Frey will shortly publish, *Rudiments of the Hebrew language, with Rules, Examples, and Exercises, for translating from English into Hebrew, as well as from Hebrew into English; together with a key of the book of Psalms, containing the true pronunciation; different significations, and grammatical analysis of every word.*

NOTICE OF

HORÆ PELASGICÆ; PART THE FIRST. Containing an Inquiry into the Origin and Language of the Pelasgi, or ancient Inhabitants of Greece; with a Description of the Pelasgic or Æolic Digamma, as represented in the various Inscriptions in which it is still preserved: and an Attempt to determine its genuine Pelasgic Pronunciation. By HERBERT MARSH, D.D. F.R.S. Margaret Professor of Divinity in Cambridge. Cambridge, 1815. 8vo. pp. 146. 7s. 6d. Murray.

WHEN it was announced that the subject of Pelasgic antiquities was to be handled by a writer so celebrated as Dr. Marsh, we ha-

turally expected the appearance of his treatise with great impatience, and, as soon as it appeared, hastened to prepare a notice of it for our readers. From his acquirements, his industry, his judgment, and above all, from his accurate and extensive acquaintance with German literature, that is to say, with the literature of a nation who have contributed infinitely more than any other to the elucidation of classical as well as sacred antiquity, we of course expected a most satisfactory result of his inquiries; and it would appear as an insult to the opinion of our classical readers, were we to declare that we have not been disappointed. Where it is impossible to write any thing but praise, a dissertation of our own would be utterly tiresome and offensive to our readers; and, therefore, all that we shall do, is to give as brief an analysis as possible of the work, accompanied with proper extracts: but the subject to be examined includes so very extensive a field for inquiry, that even compressing the matter as much as possible, we shall be obliged to exceed our usual limits.

"As the Pelasgi," says Dr. M. "according to Strabo, were not only μέγα οἴνος¹ but τῶν περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα δυναστευσάντων ἀρχαὶ ὄτατοι,² an inquiry into their origin and language cannot fail to excite the interest of the scholar, the philosopher, and the historian. Yet there is hardly an historical question which has been involved in greater perplexity; and certainly none, on which opinion has been more divided. These same Pelasgi have by turns been represented in the works of modern writers, as Egyptians, Philistines, Phoenicians,³ Bactrians, Scythians, Goths, and Celts, according as it best suited their respective systems. But though we cannot obtain the certainty of historical *evidence* for the origin of so ancient a people, we may obtain something more solid than mere conjecture: we may at least derive the benefit of historical *induction*.

¹ Lib. xiii. p. 621. ed. Casaubon.

² Lib. vii. p. 327.

³ Fessler, in his *Introductio in studium Ling. Orientalium*, p. 16, (prefixed to his *Institut. LL. OO.* 8vo. Wratislaviae, 1787) has given the following scale of the colonization of the earth. (We merely cite the part relating to the Pelasgi.)

SYRI.	
Phœnicii.	Leucosyri.
Arabes.	Pelasgi.
	Græci.

He deduces from the inhabitants of Caucasus, the Assyrians, from whom he again deduces the Syrians on one hand, and the Chaldeans on the other. At p. 19, he says, "Ex diversis—Scytharum, Syrorum, et Phœniciorum Consilio PELASCI, et ex his Græci originem traxerunt." REVIEWER.

To give this historical induction the weight of which it is capable, we must collect all the accounts which can be obtained of the Pelasgi, from the writings of the Greeks themselves: we must arrange those accounts in such an order, as will best enable us to trace the Pelasgi upwards, as high as our data will carry us; and then consider what probable conclusion may be drawn."

Dr. M. begins his collection with the testimony of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, a very acute writer, who took particular pains to discover the origin and history of the Pelasgi, though he represents them as *autochthones* in that country, beyond which his researches did not carry him. He says,¹ "Ην τὸ τῶν Πελασγῶν γένος Ἑλληνικὸν, ὃς Πελοπονῆσου τὸ ἀρχαῖον. Ἐχρήσατο δὲ τύχαις δυσπότμοις, εἰς πολλὰ μὲν καὶ ἄλλα, μάλιστα δὲ εἰς τὴν πολύπλανον τε, καὶ οὐδενὸς τόπου βέβαιον οἶκησιν. πρώτον μὲν γὰρ περὶ τὸ καλούμενον νῦν Ἀχαϊκὸν Ἀργος φησαν αὐτόχθονες ὄντες, ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ περὶ ἀυτῶν λέγουσι. τὴν δὲ ἐπωνυμίαν ἔλαθον ἐξ ἀρχῆς ταῦτην ἀπὸ τοῦ Πελασγοῦ βασιλέως." There is a difference, however, in regard to the part of Peloponnesus, which they are supposed to have occupied: some writers represent *Achaia* as their original country, while others place them in the adjacent country of *Arcadia*.² But whatever part of Peloponnesus they first occupied, they gradually spread themselves over the whole peninsula, which was thence originally called *Pelasgia*.³ The old inhabitants of the northern coast of Peloponnesus, who, according to Herodotus, changed afterwards their name to Ionians, were distinguished by the title of *Πελασγοὶ Αἰγιαλέες*,⁴ while the Arcadians were distinguished by the title of *Πελασγοὶ Ἀρκάδες*.⁵ Greece, likewise, without the isthmus, appears to have been originally inhabited by these same Pelasgi.⁶ They were likewise in possession of Boeotia, Phocis, and Eubœa.⁷ That the Pelasgi established themselves also on the western side of Greece appears from the oracle of Dodona, which Strabo calls *Πελασγῶν ἴδημα*: and from

¹ Horæ Pelasg. p. 1—2.

² Antiquitates Romanæ, l. i. c. 17.

³ Plutarch, Quæst. Romm. (tom. ii. p. 286, ed. Xylandri) speaking of the Arcadians, compares them with their native oak. Pliny (Hist. Nat. l. iv. c. 6) says that Arcadia was once called *Pelasgis*; and Pausanias (l. viii. c. 1) says in reference to a former writer, Πελασγοῦ δὲ βασιλεύοντος, γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ χώρᾳ Πελασγιαν φησὶν ἔνομα.

⁴ See Strabo (l. v. p. 221): Herodotus (l. ii. c. 171): Callimach. Hymn. in Pallad. l. 4, and Spanheim's note tom. ii. p. 607, ed. Ernesti; and Apoll. Rhod. Argon. i. 1024, where the Greek scholiast says, in reference to Peloponnesus, τὸ παλαιὸν Πελασγὺς ἐκάλεστο.

⁵ Herod. vii. 94.

⁶ Herod. i. 146.

⁷ See Herod. i. 57. viii. 44. v. 64. vi. 137. Thucyd. ii. 17. Pausan. i. 28. Strab. ix. p. 401, and Dionys. Hal. i. 28.

⁸ See Dionys. Hal. i. 18. Apoll. Rhod. Argon. i. 1024, and his Scholiast.

⁹ vii. p. 327, and Herod. ii. 52. *

the circumstance, that Homer¹ has given the title of Pelasgic to Jupiter Dodonæus. They established themselves in Epirus, as appears from Strabo;² and also in Thessaly, as appears from the epithet Πελασγικὸς, which Homer³ has given to Argos.

From the expression κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν, it seems that the Pelasgi once occupied the *whole* of Greece: hence, according to Herodotus, Greece in general was originally termed Πελασγία, the name Ἑλλὰς not being employed as a generic term till after the Trojan war.⁴ That the terms Ἑλλὰς and Ἑλλῆς were in the time of Homer confined to a district of Thessaly, appears from a passage quoted above; and that the name Ἑλλὰς was not applied to Greece in general till after the Trojan war, is asserted by Thucydides.⁵

If we go northward from Thessaly to Thrace, we again trace the Pelasgi in that country from the earliest ages:⁶ in the island of Samothrace, at the mouth of the Hebrus, they instituted the mysteries of the Cabiri.⁷ Homer, too, when he describes the φύλα Πελασγῶν, which were among the *Trojan* auxiliaries, represents them as neighbours of the Thracians:⁸ immediately after the Thracians, he describes the *Cicones*, and then the *Peonians*, who lived in the neighbourhood of Mount Hæmus. Having thus gone to the extremity of the European countries which sent auxiliaries to Troy, he returns, at line 851, to the enumeration of their Asiatic auxiliaries. Since then Homer proceeds westward in his description, from the Hellespont to Mount Hæmus, and includes the φύλα Πελασγῶν in this description, we must conclude, that like the *Cicones*, they then inhabited some part of the extensive country called Thrace. This inference derives additional weight from the circumstance, that the *Peonians*, who are likewise included in this description, and who are sometimes represented as Thracians, were themselves a race of Pelasgi. There was, indeed, a town called Larissa, to the *East* of the Hellespont, near Troy; but the Larissa, from which these Pelasgi came, was far distant from Troy:

¹ Il. II. 233. Ζεῦ ἄντα, Δωδωνᾶς, Πελασγικέ.

² v. p. 221.

³ Il. B. 681. Compare Strabo, v. p. 221. Dionys. Hal. i. 17. the Scholiast on Apoll. Rhod. Argon. i. 14. and Apoll. Rhod. himself, Argon. i. 580. and the Schol. See also Herod. i. 56. Strabo v. p. 220. vii. p. 329.

⁴ See Herod. ii. 56, viii. 44. The term Pelasgi is frequently used by Latin writers to denote the Greeks in general, especially those of the early ages of Greece. See Virgil, Aen. i. 626, ii. 83, 151. Ovid, Met. xii. 19. Her. ix. 3.

⁵ i. 3.

⁶ If they occupied both Thrace and Thessaly, they must have occupied the intermediate country of Macedonia, which is frequently considered as attached either to the one, or to the other. See Herod. i. 56, Strab. x. p. 471, and Justin, vii. 1.

⁷ Herod. ii. 51.

⁸ It. B. 340.

for when their leader Hippothous was killed by Ajax, Homer says¹ that he fell

Tῆλ' ἀπὸ Αὔριστονς ἐπιβαλλανος.

And the reasons already assigned prevent us from seeking with Strabo² for this Pelasgic Larissa at any distance to the south of Troy. Heyne therefore says,³ “*Suspicari licet inter Thracem Europæ conseditisse turmas Pelasgorum.*” At any rate, we know from Herodotus, that the island of Samothrace, at the mouth of the Hebrus, was occupied at a very early age by the Pelasgi.⁴

Having thus made a very complete collection of what respects the Pelasgi in the Greek writers, Dr. M., after many remarks, we need not say distinguished by accuracy and acuteness, but which, on account of their extent, we cannot here cite, concludes his first chapter in the following manner :

“ After all, then, we must be contented with tracing the Pelasgi up to their *European* settlement in Thrace. *Beyond* that limit their history is all conjecture. We may infer, indeed, from the known progress of migration, that among the ancestors of the *Thracian* Pelasgi some must have been once established in *Asia Minor*; and Meneclates Elaita, in his work περὶ κτίσεων, asserted that they actually were so.⁵ We may further conclude, that their ancestors were once established still more to the eastward. But Thrace will still remain the limit of the *actual knowledge*, which we possess, on the origin of the Pelasgi. And it is useful to know the limit; for hence we know, when we are arguing about the Pelasgi, whether we are building on a rock, or building on the sand.”

Having thus traced the origin of the Pelasgi, as far as his data would admit, Dr. M. proceeds, in the second chapter, to inquiries respecting their language. The extreme labor attending such researches need scarcely be mentioned to such of our readers as dedicate their time to inquiries into the tongue of ancient nations; and no description which we could give would convey any adequate idea of it to such as have not turned their studies that way. For nearly the same reasons, we shall give but a very brief account of this chapter; because our philological readers would not be contented with the very meagre sketch which could be given in an article of this kind, and therefore would naturally examine the book itself; while readers who are not critics, or who would, in the language of the Bentleian age, rank themselves in the class of “*elegant scholars*,” would certainly not be interested with a detail of the kind; supposing they could, by any miracle, summon sus-

¹ Il. P. 301.

² xiii. p. 621.

³ Toma. iv., p. 417, of his edition of Homer.

⁴ Horæ Pelasg. p. 2—11.

⁵ Strabo, lib. xiii. p. 621.

sufficient resolution to read through it, leaving for a few moments the flowery fields of Parnassus.

What language the Pelasgi spake was a question even in the time of Herodotus, who confesses himself unable to furnish any satisfactory answers: ἦν τινα γλῶσσαν οὐσαν οἱ Πελασγοὶ οὐκ ἔχω λαρυγγίως πεπιστεῖν;¹ but we shall conclude, he thinks, that they spake some barbarous dialect (*βάργβαρην γλῶσσαν*) if we argue from the remnant of the Pelasgi, who occupy the town of Creston, beyond the Tyrrhenians. If, therefore, the people of Creston spake a language different from their neighbours, Herodotus inferred that their language was a remnant of the Pelasgi. This test, however, was not satisfactory: the Crestonians were a race of Thracians:² and we learn from Strabo,³ that people of various nations mingled themselves with the Thracians. In addition to this, Thucydides⁴ has made a distinction between the ἔθνος Ηελλήνων and the ἔθνος Κρητώνων. The Crestonian dialect cannot, therefore, be regarded as genuine Pelasgic: and the reasoning on which Herodotus has founded his test, falls immediately to the ground.

If we thoroughly consider the subject, we shall have abundant reason to conclude that the Pelasgi spake Greek. Dr. M. examines the objections which have or might be made to this opinion, from the nominal distinction between the ἔθνος Πελασγικὸν and the ἔθνος Ἑλληνικόν: and afterwards proceeds as follows:

"Indeed, Herodotus himself, though he opposes the language of the Hellenes to the language of the Pelasgi, has afforded us the means of proving, that γλῶσσα Πελασγικὴ, and γλῶσσα Ἑλληνικὴ, are only *different terms for the same language*. In the very chapter (Lib. i. cap. 56) where he draws the line between the ἔθνος Πελασγικὸν, and the ἔθνος Ἑλληνικόν, he makes *another* division of the Greeks, and likewise in reference to their *language*. This division is the Γένος Δωρικὸν, and the Γένος Ιωνικόν. The Γένος Δωρικὸν, he adds, belonged to the ἔθνος Πελασγικόν: and, moreover, he adds at the end of the chapter, that this very term ΔΩΡΙΚΟΝ was given to the ἔθνος Πελασγικὸν, when it settled in Peloponnesus, (ἐξ Πελοπόννησου ἐλθόν Δωρικὸν ἐκλήθη.) Is not this an admission, that the Pelasgi spake the Doric dialect, and consequently a dialect of that very language, which was used by Herodotus himself? Further, says Herodotus in the same chapter, that as the Pelasgic nation included the Dorian genus, so the Dorian genus included the Lacedæmonians. But, who has ever doubted whether the Lacedæmonians spake Greek?"

We must content ourselves with one quotation more from this part of the work.

¹ Lib. i. 57.

² Herodot. v. 3.

³ Strab. vii. p. 395, 304, 305.

⁴ Thucyd. iv. 109.

⁵ Hor. Pelasg. p. 27.

" If further proof were wanted, we might appeal again to Herodotus himself, in the place where he afterwards describes the religion of the Pelasgi. He says (Lib. ii. cap. 52) that the Pelasgi worshipped and sacrificed to the gods, but without knowing their names, which they long afterwards learnt when those names were brought from Egypt. Χρόνου πολλοῦ διεξελθόντος, ἐπέβογτο ἐκ τῆς Αἰγύπτου ἀπικόμενα τὰ οὐνόματα τῶν Θεῶν. But he says they invoked the gods by the general name of ΘΕΟΙ. His own words are ΘΕΟΥΣ δὲ προσωνόμασάν σφας αἱρεῖσθαι τοιούτου, διτὶ κόσμῳ ΘΕΝΤΕΣ τὰ πάντα πρῆγματα. Now, if the Pelasgi not only called the gods ΘΕΟΙ, but so called them from ΘΕΩ, the root of τίθημι, because the gods founded all things, what better evidence can we have that the Pelasgi spake Greek?

" It was, indeed, too common with the Greek writers to call their ancestors *barbarians*, as if they had belonged to a totally different race. Of this we have a remarkable instance in the Cratylus of Plato, which serves at the same time to show, that the reproach was without foundation. After an examination of many other words, says Hermogenes to Socrates, But what do you think of the words ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ? To which Socrates replies (tom. i. p. 409, ed. Serrati), 'Εννοῶ δι τολλά οἱ Ἑλλήνες οὐνόματα, ἀλλας τε ὑπὸ τοῖς βαρβάροις οἰκουντες, παρὰ των ΒΑΡΒΑΡΩΝ εἰλήφασι. And he adds, Εἴτις Κροῖ ταῦτα κατὰ τὴν ἙΛΛΗΝΙΚΗΝ ονομὴν ᾖς ἐσικότως κεῖται, ἀλλὰ μη κατὰ ἔκεινην ἐξ ἣς τὸ ονομα τυγχάνει ὁν, οἰσθα δι τὸ ποροῦ ἄν. Here the term βάρβαροι is applied to the *ancient* inhabitants of Greece, as if they had spoken a different language from that which was used by Socrates and Plato. The same assertion is repeated at p. 425, παρὰ βαρβάρων τινῶν αὐτὰ παρειλήφαμεν. εἰσὶ δὲ ημῶν ἀρχαιότεροι βάρβαροι. But if the same terms were common both to the ancient and to the modern inhabitants of Greece, we cannot infer, that the language of the one was *different* from the language of the other, though the language of the one was more *polished* than that of the other. In fact, when Socrates is made to say, that the terms ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ were not of *Hellenic* but of *barbaric* origin, nothing more could be meant, than that those words, as being primitives in the Greek language, were capable of no further *resolution* in that language. Nothing therefore was left, in regard to the derivation of these words, than to do as we *always* do in deriving the primitives of any language; namely, to inquire in what other language or languages these words had been *previously* used. On the supposition, therefore, that the *ancient* inhabitants of Greece spake a barbarous language, it appeared that sufficient provision had been made for the etymology of ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ. But, in fact, it was the same sort of etymology as it would be, if we derived a word in Klopstock or Wieland from a word used by Kero or Ottfried; and it amounts to nothing more than that ΠΤΡ and ΤΔΩΡ were used in Greece above a thousand years before Socrates was born. But, says Socrates further, (p. 410) "Ορα τοίνυν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ ονομα τὸ ΠΤΡ μῆτι βαρβαρικὸν ἡ· τοῦτο γάρ οὐδὲ ἥδιον προσάθαι ἐστὶν ἙΛΛΗΝΙΚΗ φωνῇ φανεροὶ τ' εἰσὶν οὐτας αὐτὸ καλούντες ΦΥΓΕΣ, σμικρὸν τι παρακλίνοντες. Now all this is perfectly consistent with the opinion, that the Pelasgi spake Greek. The language of the Pelasgi was planted in a common soil with many other languages, and of course had numerous words in common

with other languages. And its agreement with the Phrygian in particular cannot appear extraordinary, when we consider what Herodotus says, Lib. vii. cap. 73. Οι δὲ Φρύγες, ὡς Μακεδόνες λέγουσι, ἐκαλέονται Βερύς χρόνος ὅσον Εὐρωπής εόντες σύνοικοι ἦσαν Μαχεδόνες. Now, if the Phrygians were originally neighbours of the Macedonians, and used the Macedonic dialect, in substituting Β for Φ, it is no wonder that Greek words should be found among the Phrygians. Indeed, the two words, which Plato selected are common to a great variety of languages. The Hebrew פָּרָה, that is ūr, signifies fire. The same word (probably not derived from the Hebrew, but drawn from a common source) was used by the Pelasgi, and pronounced after their peculiar mode פָּרָג, which the Macedonians (probably also the Phrygians, of whom Plato says συμφόρον τι παραχλίνοντες) pronounced בָּרָג, and the other Greeks Πύρ. The word ύδωρ, pronounced by the Pelasgi Φυδώρ, is connected with the Saxon word Water, as their פָּרָג is connected with the Saxon פָּרָג. In short, the two words selected by Plato as words of barbaric origin, were only words which both ancient and modern Greeks had in common with many other nations, who drew from the same source."

Dr. M. afterwards goes on to show that one principal difference between Pelasgic Greek and more polished Greek was occasioned by the use of the Digamma. We learn from Dionysius of Halicarnassus,¹ that the Pelasgi said Φελέη, καὶ Φάναξ, καὶ Φοῖκος, καὶ Φαρῆς, καὶ πολλὰ τοιοῦτα: and that the form of the Digamma was, μῶνερ Γάμμα, διτταῖς ἐπὶ μίᾳ ὁρθῇ ἐπιζευγνύμενον ταῖς πλαγίαις. The antiquity of this digamma appears from his saying σύνθετες ἦν τοὺς ἀρχαῖοὺς Ἑλληνούς. Upon the whole, Dr. M. concludes, that Pelasgic Greek was in truth Eolic; and, consequently, that instead of using the term Eolic Digamma, it would be more correct to say Pelasgic Digamma.

The third chapter treats of the form of the Digamma as represented in ancient inscriptions and similar documents. Here we need only mention, that the Digamma occurs in two forms: namely F, like the Latin F, except that both cross strokes are of the same length; and C, which occurs in a few coins, and in the Codex Bezae, Mark xv. 33, (p. 650. ed. Kipling).

The fourth chapter treats concerning the pronunciation of the Digamma, which Dr. M. has shown was pronounced like the Latin F, not as the English W. His reasoning is too connected to admit of an extract, and too concise to be abridged; and we therefore must refer the reader to the work itself. We shall conclude our account of the work, however, with one extract which contains a correction of a false interpretation, though in England a common one, of a passage in the writings of Gerard Vossius.

" That the Latin V was pronounced, not like the English W, but like

the English V, is an opinion conformable with that of Gerard Vossius, one of the most eminent among the Latin grammarians since the revival of learning; though, by a strange fatuity, a passage in his treatise *De Arte Grammatica* has contributed more, than any other cause, to propagate in *Englund* the contrary opinion. In his treatise, *De arte Grammatica*, lib. i. c. 24, he cautions his readers against pronouncing F and V in the same manner: and he thus argues, that they had a different sound: aliter F, aliter V, sonare argumento sunt voces in quibus utrumque occurrit, ut *vofor*, *saveo*, *fovea*, *fuleus*, et similes. Now, if Gerard Vossius had been writing for English readers, this caution would have been unnecessary: for it is not usual, at least in this country, to pronounce V like F: their W being the letter which has the sound of the English V. Hence the Germans pronounce *Wind*, as if it were written *Vind*; and *Vater* (which is the German for *Father*) they pronounce as if it were written *Fater*: the word *Volk*, which corresponds to the English *Folk*, they pronounce as if it were written *Folk*. This pronunciation of V like F in *German* words was transferred to the pronunciation of *Latin* words. That it was so in the time of Gerard Vossius, appears from what he says, c. 26, Germani pronunciant Latinorum *Vinum* quasi esset *Finum*. This pronunciation, therefore, it was his object to correct: He accordingly tells his countrymen, that they ought not to pronounce the *Latin* V like *their* V, but like *their* W. He instances, in c. 26, two German words corresponding with the Latin, which, according to the orthography of the sixteenth century, he writes *Wijn* and *Wint*, (now written *Wein* and *Wind*); and he adds, nec aliter extulere Latini *vinum*, *ventus*, quam *winum*, *wentus*. Again, he says in c. 24, of the manner in which the *Latins* pronounced V, in contradistinction of the manner in

¹ “I am here speaking with reference to the *High German*, the language of *Gerard Vossius*, who was a native of *Heidelberg*: for in the *Low German*, which is spoken in Lower Saxony and other parts of Northern Germany, the V has a softer sound. And the soft sound of the V in Low German has had some influence on the pronunciation even of the High German in those parts, where Low German was formerly spoken. Thus in the Electorate of Hanover, Low German, though it is now spoken only by the peasants, was once the *general* language; and so it remained, till after the time of Luther, when the High German became the language of literature, and was therefore adopted by men of education, even where Low German had been previously spoken. But hence arose a *mixture* of pronunciation; and the High German has lost in the North of Germany somewhat of that hardness, which it has ever retained in the middle and South of Germany, where it was *always* spoken. Hence the German V, which is pronounced as F at Dresden, Leipzig, and Wittenberg, is pronounced with a softer sound at Hanover. But Adelung, the great German grammarian, is decidedly of opinion, that to give the High German V the sound of the Low German V, is contrary to the analogy of the language: and hence he lays it down as a rule, that the *proper* sound of V in the High German language is the same with that of F. There is indeed one exception, namely, when it occurs in the middle of a word *between two vowels*. It then unavoidably assumes a softer tone; and on the same principle as that which converted the *Latin* F into the *Latin* V, when it represented the *Digamma* between two vowels.”

which the *Germans* pronounced it; Olim vero longe etiam majus disorsum erat; quia V efferebant, ut *Germani* duplex W. Nempe pronunciabant *Winum*, *Wallum*, *Widua*, *Wacillare*, &c. unde nostrum *Wijn*, *Walle*, *Weduwe*, *Waggen*, &c. Siuce, then, the Germans pronounce W, as we pronounce V, the rule thus given by Vossius, when applied to the English language, would be, that the Latin V was pronounced like the English V. But English critics, not knowing the difference between their own W, and the German W, and not considering that Gerard Vossius, as a German, was giving rules for the Germans, have argued from this passage, as if Gerard Vossius was authority for the opinion, that the Latins pronounced *Vinum*, *Vallum*, *Vidua*, in the same manner as the English pronounce *Wine*, *Wall*, *Widow*. I have even seen the passage quoted with English examples substituted for the German, with the exception of the German word for *vacillare*, because we do not say *Wacillate*, but *Vacillate*. And as the word *nostrum* immediately precedes those examples, the quotation, with these substitutions, makes Gerard Vossius speak as if he had been a native Englishman.

“ The preceding remarks on the pronunciation of the Latin V have not been made on the supposition, that the sound of the Greek F depended on the sound of the Latin V, but merely because the two questions have been connected by most writers upon this subject. In whatever manner Cicero may have pronounced the Latin V, the Pelasgi, who brought letters into Latium, had no other sound for their F, than such as was given to F by the Latins, who learnt from them, and is still given to it by those who in their turn have learnt from the Latins.”

We are informed by Dr. M. that the second part of the *Horæ Pelasgicæ* will contain an history of the Greek alphabet, from its origin to its completion. It is not yet published; but when it appears, we shall take an early opportunity of giving an analysis of it to our readers.

E. H. BARKERI EPISTOLA
AD G. H. SCHÆFERUM

De quibusdam HESYCHII et ETYMOLOGICI Glossis.

“**E**TYMOLOGICUM tuum,” SCHÆFERE, ut Salmasii verba in Epistola ad G. I. Vossium usurpem, “sub prelo sudare, libens audivi : præclarum opus, ut omnia tua sunt, avide expecto.” Notulas nostras in quasdam Hesychii et Etymologici illius glossas judicio tuo hodie non veritus sum subjecere. Totum humanitati, eruditioni, æquanimitati tuae me devovo. Vale, vir ἔξοχώτατος, et si jam pateris, φίλτατε.

Datum Thetfordiae. Pridie Nonas Octobris. MDCCCXV.

Timæus Lex. Plat. : ‘Ρυμβεῖν ῥομβεῖν, τοῦτο δὲ ἀπὸ τῆς κινήσεως τοῦ ρόμβου. “Glossam nostram descripsit Suidas : hoc verbum neque ap. Platonem inveni, neque ap. ullum veterum scriptorum.” Ruhnkenius. Alter Suidæ locus Ruhnkenium præteriit: ‘Ρομβεῖν σφενδονῶν. H. Steph. Ind. Thes. : “‘Ρομβέω, circumago, vel volvo in modum rhombi : exponitur et σφενδονῶν a Suida.” Schneiderus Lex. Append. : “‘Ρομβέω, Attisch s. v. a. ῥομβέω, Plato Cratili s. 92. wie die Wolf. Handschr. und Timæus lasen, wo vorher ῥέμβειν stand.” Vox exstat quoque ap. Hesych. : Βεμβικίζει ῥομβεῖ, στρέφει, διώκει. Compositum περιρομβεῖν exstat ap. Pindari Schol. Pyth. IV, 381. : Λαμβάνουσαι αἱ φαρμακίδες τὴν ὕγγα, δεσμεύουσιν ἐκ τροχοῦ τινος, ὃν περιρομβεῦσιν, ἄμα ἐπάδουσαι. Eadem verba D. Schottus in Appendice affert e Lycophronis Schol. 310., et refert ad Phavor. Exstat quoque ap. Hesych. in corrupta glossa, quam optime restituit T. Hemsterh. ap. Albert. : Περικωνῆσαι περιρομβῆσαι, περισαγγεῖν : “Περικωνῆσαι bene explicatur περιρομβῆσαι, περισαγγεῖν : nam κώνα, βέμβιξ, teste Hesych. et κωνᾶν, περισινεῖν.” Idem est κωνάζω, κωνάξω, Doribus, unde Epicharmi σκυφοκώνακτος, in qua voce ap. Hesych. lege περιφόρητος.” Verbum περιρομβεῖν in H. Steph. T. G. L. non reperitur. Schneiderus confundit κωνᾶ i. q. περιδινεῖν, a κώνα, i. e. βέμβιξ, cum verbo κωνεῖν, unde περικωνεῖν ap. Aristoph.

¹ Mirum est T. H. non meminisse Hesych. loci supra memorati: Βεμβικίζει ῥομβεῖ, στρέφει, διώκει: ut Hesych. explicat βεμβικίζει per ῥομβεῖ, et κώνα per βέμβιξ, quid dubitemus de explanatione τοῦ περικωνῆσαι per περιρομβεῖν?

Vesp. 598., i. e. *pice inungere*, a κῶνος, *pix liquida*. Eadēm confusio ab Hesychii interpretib⁹, et forte ab Hesychio ipso, facta est. Verbum κωνίζειν, *pice inungere*, non agnoscit H. Steph.: de eo scribit jejune eruditiss. Schneid. in Lex. “*Kωνίζω*, ich piche, *pico*, von κῶνος; no. 5.” Græci usurpabant non modo κωνῆσαι πίθον, sed et κωνίσαι. Fallitur Albertius, cum ad v. κωνῆσαι scribit: “*Leg. κωνίσαι πιστικωνίσαι*, a κωνίζειν, *pice inungere*, unde sup. κεκάνισται πεπίσσωται, κέκλυσται, quod Hesych: h. l. cum κωνῆσαι, a κωνᾶν, ut in aliis s̄c̄pius, confudit, non animadvertisse H. Steph.” Fallitur quoque T. Hemsterh., cum ad v. περικωνῆσαι, contrario errore, i. in η mutat (ut Alb. η in i), legens κεκάνηται pro κεκάνισται, et διακωνῆσαι pro διακωνίσαι. Hesych. Διακωνίσαι διακλαῦσαι (l. διακλύσαι, vel potius διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ κωνίσαι, ὅπερ ἐστὶν πίσση χέλουι. Verbum διακωνίσαι, quod H. Steph. Ind. Thes. minus recte mutat in διακωνῆσαι, Schneid. omisit. Idem H. Steph. Ind. Thes. notavit confusionem vocum κωνῆσαι, et κωνίσαι, sed errat, cum putat meliorem scripturam esse διὰ τοῦ η: nam, ut diximus, Græci usurpabant et κωνίσαι πίθον, et κωνῆσαι πίθον. Hæc sunt ipsius verba:—“*Κωνᾶν* Hesych. περιδινεῖν, circumagere, quod et βεμβηχίσαι. Idem Aor. κωνῆσαι exponit non solum κύκλῳ περιεγκεῖν, sed etiam πιστοκονῆσαι, unde ab Aeschilo et Cratino in Crescere πιστοκόνητον μόφον dici ἦταν πίσσῃ καταχρισθέντες τινὲς ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀποθάνωσι. Verum non modo habet κωνῆσαι per η, sed etiam κωνίσαι per i, in utraque significatione. Nam in πιστοκονήτῳ dicit κωνίσαι esse τὸ περιαγαγεῖν, forsitan κῶνος, et in serie τοῦ κεcum ē, κεκάνισται exponit πεπίσσωται, κέκλυσται. Sed alteram scripturam διὰ τοῦ η meliorem esse docet Etymologus etiam, dicens κωνᾶν esse τὸ στρέφειν, et κωνῆσαι ap. Aristoph. in Tagenistis τὸ περιεγκεῖν, a nomine κῶνης, quod est βέμβιξ. Proprie autem κωνῆσαι esse ait τὸ κέραμον πισσώσαται.”

Ex Etymologi loco a Steph. laudato manifestum est, Etymologum confundere v. κωνᾶν, i. e. στρέψειν, cūm v. κωνεῖν, sive κωνίζειν, i. e. *pice inungere*: cf. Kusterus ad Hesych. v. Διακωνίσαι.

Ex Hesychii locis a Steph. laudatis manifestum est, Hesychium, cum prorsus eandem faciat confusionem, agnoscere tamen et κωνίσαι et κωνῆσαι.

Si Hesychii interpretes hæc perspexissent, fortasse medicas manus ad sanos non adhibuissent locos. In Hesychio fere nihil est mutandum præter loca e literarum ordine plane vitiosa. Ut nihil sine testibus bonis dicamus, pauca afferemus exempla confusionis modo dictæ, ab ipsis grammaticis veteribus factæ inter κωνᾶν, κωνεῖν, et κωνίζειν.

Hesych. Πιστοκωνήτῳ περὶ τίσσῃ χρίουσιν, ἵνα τάχιον κατακαίηται κωνῆσαι δέ ἐστι, τὸ περιεγκεῖν. (Phot. Lex. Ms. Πιστοκωνήτῳ πυρὶ τῷ αἰκανότῳ, ἐπεὶ τὰ καιόμενα πίσσῃ χρίσται, Λισχύλος Κρήτας;) Phot.

Lex. Κωνῆσαι περιενεγκεῖν, διακαῖσαι (l. διακαῦσαι, vel διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τῶν πιστούντων ἐπεὶ περιδινοῦσιν ἐν κύκλῳ τὰ τιστούμενα. **Hesych.** Κωνῆσαι πιστοκοπῆσαι, καὶ κύκλῳ περιενεγκεῖν καὶ Πιστοχόντον μόρῳ λέγουσιν, ὅταν πίσσῃ καταχρισθέντες τινὲς ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀπιθάνωσιν. Λισχύλης καὶ Κρατῖνος Κρήσσαις¹. Πιστοχονία γὰρ η̄ νῦν πισιδία, η̄ χρέουσι τὰ παρισθμικά τῶν προβάτων. **H. l.** pro πιστοκοπῆσαι critici scribunt πιστοκωνῆσαι, sed **H. Steph.** et **Schneid.** rectissime agnoscunt πιστοκοπέω, et πιστοκωνέω² (ap. **H. Steph.** πιστοκωνάω scribitur, per errorem, ut infra videbimus). Emendant quoque πιστοχόντον περ πιστοκώητον vel πιστοχώντον, sed hoc non est mutandum. **Hesych.** in uno loco scribit πιστοκώητον μόρον, ut in ipsa Aeschyli fabula scriptum invenerat, a κωνέω derivatum; in altero loco per memorias lapsum scribit πιστοχόντον μόρον, quia ei tunc in mentem forte venerat verbum κονίζω, i. q. κωνίζω (ut infra demonstrabitur), sive κωνέω: κονίζω ei h. l. versari ante animum, patet e voc. πιστοκονία, quod τῷ πιστοχόντον immediate subjungitur.

E v. πιστοχόντον omnino defendit **Hesychii** glossa, quae interpres valde torsit: *λεωκόνιτος λεωλίθριος, η̄ λεωκόρητος, παντελᾶς ἔξολοθευόμενος.* Kusterus legit λεωκόρητος, dicens “τὸ λεωκόνιτος esse vocem nihil, vel ab ipso Hesychio ex mendoso codice excerp- tam, vel a librariis corruptam.” Sed omnino proba est vox λεωκό- νιτος, ut vidit Albertius:—“Phot. Lex. Ms. I.-ωκόρητος: ἔξωλοθρευ- μένος τὸ γὰρ λένις ἐστὶ τελέως, (sic) Ἀρχιλοχος³: τέως γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐτρένετο, καὶ λεωργὺς ἀπὸ τούτου, ὁ μειωλουργὺς, leg. μεγαλουργός: Galen. Gloss. Λέως πατελᾶς, ἀπαν: Erotian. Λίως τελέως. Rectius λείως, ut sup. suo loco, ubi male λείωσις, ut λειωρ in v. λειοκόνιτος, quod τὸ λεωκόνιτος h. l. tueri queat. Sup. Κονίζεσθαι φείρεσθαι. Ita λεωκόνιτος est τελείως κονιζόμενος, i. e. φείρομενος, cum quo convenient seqq. interpreta- tiones.” **λεωκόνιτος**, quod ad sensum attinet, est i. q. λεωκόρητος, sed, quod ad etymologiam, valde diversum: λεωκόνιτος compositum est e duabus vocibus, λέως i. e. τελέως, et κονίζειν i. e. φείρειν: at λεωκόρητος venit e λέως i. e. τελέως, et κοφέω, ut mox videbimus. In Hesychio duæ glossæ sunt confusæ, quarum una, λεωκόνιτος, quod exponit per λεωλίθριος: altera, λεωκόρητος, quod exponit per

¹ Aretaeus de Cur. Morb. diurn. I, 2. p. 117. ed. Boerh.: Πιστο- κονία τῷ ἡμιπάττῳ ξυπνήσις: ubi Maittaire in Indice: “Πιστοκοτῆ, πίσ- οβλινεῖ, πιστοκοπούμενος” Athen. 565. B. ex Alexide.” Ibi doctissimum Schweigh. “Rarius occurrit verbum πιστοκοπῆσαι, pro usitatiore πιστοῦσαι, quod in eadem re positum XII, p. 518. a. Repertum est tamen illud ap. alium nescio quem veterem auctorem, cuius verba citavit Clem. Alex. in Pædag. III, p. 294. ed. Pott. ubi ait: ἵστη- κονίδεος οὐδεὶς πολλοὺς ἐστοι καὶ πιστοκοπημένους: item ap. Hesych. Καπησαι πιστοκοπῆσαι, quo loco doctissimum editorem, citantem ista ex Elemente verba, præterierat hoc Alexidis testimonium.” Voc. πι- στοκονία omisit H. Steph., notante Maittaire l. c.

παντελῶς ἐξολοθρευμένος, ubi lege ἐξωλοθρευμένος, ut ap. Phot. Lex.¹ Ms. Λεωκόητος· ἐξωλοθρευμένος, τὸ γὰρ λέως ἔστι τελέως: sic infra Hesych. Λεώλεθος· παντελῶς ἐξωλοθρευμένος. Vocem λεώλεθος male omisit H. Steph.: λεωλεθία habet in Indice.

Ut diximus, λεωκόητος venit e λέως i. e. τελείως, et κορέω. Suidas: *Κόρημα*² τὸ σάρον, τὸ κόσμητρον Μὴ ἐκκόρει τὴν Ἑλλάδα, ἀντὶ

¹ Vox κόρημα significat et σκῖνος, in quo purgamenta collecta deponuntur, et scopas, quibus everruntur, et purgamenta ipsa. H. Steph. Thes. II, p. 371, H.: “Κόρημα, purgamentum, id ipsum, quod verrendo collectum est, sordes verrendo collectae: Pollux VI, 15. σκῆνης δὲ καὶ σκουγιᾶς καθεάντας οἱ ὑπηρέται πάντα τὰ λιψανα τῆς τροφῆς, τὰ ἕπτα τὸ ὄδαφος ἀπέρριμμα, quibus enumeratis subjungit, ἀ καὶ κορηματα κλητίον. Κόρημα vocatur etiam ipsum σκῖνος, ut idem Pollux tradit: ambiguum an illud, in quo purgamenta illa collecta deponuntur, an scopas, quibus convertuntur: verba ejus sunt: ἵπσι τῷ πυλωρῷ τὸ καθεῖται καὶ καταρράκτει τὴν σκίναν ἀναγκαῖον ἔστι, τὰ πρόσφορα δὲ τούτου τῶν σκινῶν ἔπιταξιν, οἷον τὸ κόρημα καλεῖται δὲ οὕτω καὶ τὸ σκῖνος, καὶ τὸ καθεάντα τὸ κορημένον. Sed videtur potius accipere pro scopis, seu scopulis, ut Colum. vocat: idem et Eustath. testatur; κορηματα (inquit, expōnens locum ex Hom. citatum) ἄντι τοῦ σαρωτάτι, καλλύντας, ὅπις καὶ κόρημα τὸ σάρον, δι οὐ φιλοκαλιταῖς γῆ, quod et σάρωμεν εἰ κορημόν: sic accipitur ap. Aristoph. *Pace*, Κατάθου τὸ κόρημα, μη κορεῖ τὴν Ἑλλάδα, i. κορημένον τὸ σάρον οὐ σιάθεσσι ἀκαβάλεσσι τους βύτους τῶν οἴκων, ut docet Schol.” Fallitur H. Steph. credens ap. Pollucem l. c. (x, 28.) σκῖνος ambiguë dictum esse, quasi et pro “eo in quo purgamenta, collecta deponuntur,” et “scopis, quibus converruntur.” Nam ap. Pollucem l. c. σκῖνος esse scopas, quibus converruntur purgamenta, manifestum est e verbis continuo sequentibus ea, quæ adduxit H. Steph.: Τὸ δὲ ἥμα, κορῆι ἀ λέγοις. καὶ τὸ μὲν σκῖνος καὶ ἥμα ὑπὸ Εὐπόλιδος ἔργηται ἐν τοῖς Κόλαξι.

Touti λαβάν τὸ κόρημα, τὴν αὐλὴν κόρει· τὸ δὲ κορούμενον ī Σκηνὰς καταλαμβανούσις Ἀριστοφάνεις, μόκερ ī Καλιππίδη,

ἐπὶ τοῦ κορηματος καθέζομαι καμαί· εἰ δὲ καὶ καλλύντινοι φάσις ἀ τὸ κορῆι, ὡπου καὶ τὸ κόρημα κάλλυντρον. εἰ δὲ καὶ ταύρου φύσις τὸν βιραρόν, τὸ καλὺν κάκινο καλεῖται σάρον; In Eupolidis versu nulla est ambiguitas; ibi κόρημα procul dubio est instrumentum, quo aula verrenda sit. In Aristophanis versu κόρημα procul dubio est purgamentum ipsum. Sed in alio Pollucis loco κόρημα procul dubio est σκῖνος, in quo purgamenta collecta deponuntur: X, c. 53. πορὶ τοῦ ἐπλήρωματος ἴρων σκινῶν καὶ τοῦ ἄλλου; Σκινῶν δὲ ī Εὐπόλιδος Πόλεως κατατέλογος;

Κάννας ἀπατῶν, κόρημα, κιβωτὸν, λύχνον.

Positio vocis κόρημα inter κάννας et κιβωτὸν, ut et totius loci contextus, plane demonstrat h. l. κόρημα esse id, in quo purgamenta collecta deponuntur. Mirum est Schneiderum Lex. de voce κόρημα nihil præter hec dixisse; “Κόρημα, der Besen, von κορέι, wovon auch κόρημα, das Kehricht, der Auswurf.” Ad priorem Pollucis locum sic scribit T.

τοῦ, ἔρημον μὴ πόλεις οἰκητόρων διὰ τῶν πολέμων ἦν δὲ καὶ ἀρά τις αὐτῇ τοῖς ἀρχαῖοις, ὡς που καὶ Μένανδρός Φησιν, Ἐκκορηθείης σύ γε, ἀντὶ τοῦ, ἄρδην ἀπολεσθείης. (Id est, proprio verbi sensu retento, “ May you be swept from the earth ! ”) Menandri phrasis ab Eustathio expedita nititur ὅλως ἐκτμηθείης, notante H. Steph. T. G. L. II. p. 372. Alciphro III, 62. Ἄλλ’ ἐκκυριασθείης ὅτι ἄκαρος εἴ καὶ λέλος, ubi bene Berglerus : “ Ita scriptum, fortasse ἐκκορηθείης.” Iterum Suid. Ἐκκορηθείης παντελῶς ἀφανισθείης Μένανδρος, Ἐκκορηθείης σύ γε. Hesych. Ἐκκοροῦσιν φθείρουσιν, ἐκκαλύνουσιν : ubi Albertius : “ Cf. lepidum Parmenionis Epigr. in Antholog. I. 6. n. 3.

οἱ κόρις ἄχρι κόρου κορέσαντό μου ἀλλ’ ἐκορέσθην
ἄχρι κόρου καύτες τοὺς κόρις ἐκκορίσας.

Cimices ad satietatem saturati sunt de me, at saturatus sum et ipse ad satietatem cimices *perdendo*, sive *everrendo*: vid. Casaub. ad Theophr. Char. c. 22. p. 340. ibidemque De Pauw, p. 184. qui *everrendi* notionem retinet, a κόρις, *scopæ*, ut improprie φθείρουσι exponat Hesych. ex consequenti nimirum, et eo, quod post ἐκκορεῖν sæpe fit.” Casauboni locus, ad quem refert Albertius, est hic :— “ Καὶ ἀναστὰς, τὴν οἰκίαν καλλῦναι, καὶ τὰς κλίνας ἐκκορῆσαι : Hesych., qui τὸ κορεῖν etiam φθείρειν exponit, videtur hoc voluisse dicere, eam vocem a κόρις deductam, interdum accipi pro *cimices occidere*, vel *cimicibus lectos purgare*, quod *cimicare* Lat. dicitur, ut *pulicare*, Græci φθειρίζειν : atque hæc interpretatio locum hic habere potest : Parménio poeta ἐκκορίζειν dixit in lepidissimo disticho ap. Anthol. I, 6. p. 19.” Quod ad Theophrastum attinet, fallitur Casaub. : sensus verborum, τὰς κλίνας ἐκκορῆσαι, plane patet e precedentibus verbis, τὴν οἰκίαν καλλῦναι. Fallitur Casaub., credens Hesych. vocem ἐκκορεῖν a κόρις voluisse deducere, id quod Hesychius nequicquam voluisset. Fallitur Casaub., credens Hesych., cum v. ἐκκοροῦσιν exponit per φθείρουσιν, intelligere i. q. sibi voluisset, si dixisset φθειρίζουσιν, i. e. *cimices occidunt* : nam ἐκκορεῖν, loco τοῦ φθείρειν usurpatum, venit e proprio verbi sensu *everrere*, deinde *verrendo perdere*, sive animalia, ut cimices, sive res inanimatas, deinde generatim *perdere*, ut in Menandri loco, Ἐκκορηθείης σύγε. Fallitur quoque idem vir vere eruditissimus, cum κορεῖν facit i. q. ἐκκορίζειν : κορεῖν est *everrendo perdere*, at ἐκκορίζειν, *cimices verrendo perdere* : tanta est distantia inter κορεῖν et κορίζειν, quanta inter

Hemsterh.: “ Tὸ κόρημα pro purgamentis Attici non admittunt, ut docemur ab Atticæ loquelæ magistris, pro qua tamen significatione pugnat Aristophanis auctoritate Pollux ; Hesych. κόρημα κάλλυντρος, ὁ τις σοῦ : inde, diminuta vocis forma, κορημάτιον *scopula*, in Vet. Onom., quamvis et ibid. κόρημα *scobs*.” Voc. κορημάτιον omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Vel κόρος Hesychio est κάλλυντρος ; exemplum hujus significationis nondum invenimus.

φθείρειν et φθειρίζειν. Ex hoc igitur metaphorico verbi κορεῖ sensu pro periire venit λεωκόρητος, i. e. παντελῶς ἔξωλθευμένος.

Vocem λέως H. Steph. tantum obiter notat in v. λεωργὸς, Thes. II, p. 599., et proprium ei locum in Thes. non tribuit: "Videndum," ait H. St., "num deduci possit λεωγὸς a λεῶς, quod Galenus ap. Hippocr. accipi scribit pro παντελῶς, ἀπαν." Idem etymon Photio quoque, ut modo vidimus, placuerat. Apollon. Dyscol. p. 548. Sturz. λέως a τελέως per aphæresin derivat: Αἱ διάλεκτοι ἀφαιροῦσι καὶ πλεονάζουσι, ἐρτὴ, ὄρτὴ, τελέως, λέως, τρόμος, τέτρομος, ἔγω, ἔγανη. Ut vox scribitur tribus modis, λέως, λείως, λίως, sic voces, quarum prima pars ex hac voce originem suam trahit, tribus modis ap. Hesych. scribuntur. In ejus Lexico habemus sequentia vocabula e voce λέως derivata, λεωκόνιτος, λεώλεθρος, λεωλέθριος, λεώλης, λεωκόρητος: e voce λείως, λειοκόνιτος, (quod infra mutamus in λειοκανίτοις), λειωκόρητος: e voce λίως, λιολεθρία: λιολεθρίς παντελεῖ

¹ Notanda est vox λιωκόρητος, quam omisit Schneid. H. Steph. in Ind. Thes. scribit: "Λειοκόνιτος Hesych. ὁ τελείως ἐκκικαυμένος τοὺς ὄφθαλμοὺς ἔχων: ordo alphab. pro eo requirit λειωκόρητος." J. Voss. scribit λιωκόρητος, quod literarum ordo admittit. Albertius refert ad glossam: Κόρας: ὄφθαλμος, et addit, "quod hoc pertinere docet interpretatio." Pro ἐκκικαυμένος G. legit ἐκκικομένος. Λιων esse veram scripturam primæ partis vocis, patet ex Hesychii interpretatione τελείως: nam λιων i. q. τελείως: et κόρην a κόρην, i. q. ὄφης, ὄφθαλμος, esse posteriorem vocis partem, tunc patet ex Hesychii interpretatione, per ὄφθαλμον. Sed quid sibi velit ista vox λιωκόρητος, e vocabulis λιων i. q. τελείως, et κόρη i. q. ὄφθαλμος, derivata? et quomodo ad vocem sic compositam pertineat Hesychii explanatio, ὁ τελείως ἐκκικαυμένος (ἐκκικομένοντος) τοὺς ὄφθαλμούς? Suspiciatur Hesychii verba, quibus λειωκόρητος explicare voluit, esse quodammodo corrupta. Hesych. Λιων η προσηπής, καὶ καλή: Λιων τελείως, καλῶς.

A Lexicographis notanda est vox λιαξ sive λιαξ, quod male omisit Schneid. De ea H. Steph. Ind. Thes.: "Λιαξ Hesych. παῖς ἀρχιγένιος, forsitan παῖς τὸ λιον, quod leves et glabras genas haberet." In Thes. II, p. 662. A. sic scribit: "Λιαξ i. q. λιον, v. l. Etymol. derivat a λιον, sed non exponit." Mirum est hunc sagacissimum virum non vidisse λιαξ esse i. q. λιον: mirum quoque corruptam vocem ἀρχιγένιος retinere pro ἀρτιγένιος. "In Glossis legimus, ἀρχιγένιος: λινογένιος, imo ἀρτιγένιος," Dorvillius ad Charit. p. 216. ed. 1783., notwithstanding Alberto. Bene H. Steph. vocem λιαξ i. e. παῖς deducit a λιον: λιαξ i. q. λιογένιος, i. e. prima florens lanugine: J. Pollux II, 10. παῖς ἀδερῶν: Αγενίος, λιογένιος, ιούρη πιον ὑπαντῶν, παῖδες τὰ ὅστα καθιερωτα τὸν Ίουλον ἔχων: (ubi non viderunt interpretes Pollucem ad Xenoph. Sympos. p. 515, 41. respexisse παῖδες τὰ ὅστα ἀρτιγένειος καθιερωτοί). "Imberbis adhuc Adonis, et λιον, prima duntaxat lanugine genas habens insignes, in hoc ipso carmine dicitur v. 85. περάτων Ίουλοι ἀπὸ κροτάφων καταβάλλον Ὁ τριφύλλιος Αδωνις." Valck. ad Adoniaz. p. 408, C. J. Piersonus λιαξ pro λιαξ corrigit, quod literarum series vetat: Moeris p. 419. ψιλαξ, ἀριστοφάτης ψιλαξ καὶ λιον, "Ελληνις Thom. Mag. ψιλαξ, ποιηται, οὐ-

διέθρω: Ruhn. Ep. Crit. I, p. 55. legit λεωλεθρίζ, male, utpote et non necessarium, et contra literatum seriem: *lege λιωλεθρία*. Has distinctiones neglexerunt H. Steph. et Schneid., ap. quos nihil invenias de variis modis idem vocab. scribendi, et simplex λίως, λίωσ, et compositum, ut in λεωλεθρίς, λειωκόρης, λιω. ήσα, ceterisque vocibus.'

'Αριστοφάνης' ψιλός καὶ λίως, λογογράφοι. H. Steph. Ind.: "ψιλακα Ηεσυχ. ψιλὸς et λίων, item πτερος." (Pausan. in Lacon. p. 258. ψιλα γαρ καλοῦσιν οἱ Δαμειτις τὰ πτέρα: Glossa Labbeana: ψιλοβάφος plumarious: voc. ψιλοβάφος omisit H. Steph., ut et Schneid.) "Hesych. ψιλακα: ψιλὸν, λίων: Λιαξ: πτεριγίνειος: l. λιαξ κα λίως: sunt autem diminutiva, ut a βάλος βάλαξ, βάλος βάλαξ, λίθος λίθαξ, μύλος μύλαξ, νίος νίαξ." Pierson. ad Mœr. p. 419. Adde hęc λιμάνη, λιμάνι: σιάπτη, σιάπτηξ. Hesych. Σιάπτηξ: γογγυδής: voc. σιάπτηξ omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Voc. λιαξ H. Steph. in Thes. II. p. 709, A. posuit, sed in Indice omisit. Alia exempla diminutivorum in ἡξ larga manu dedit Bast. ad Gregor. p. 241. De verbo ἀρτιγυνιάζω H. Steph. Ind. scribit: "'Αρτιγυνιάζω ex Theophrasto affertur pro recens pubesco, non ita pridem barbam emisi; sed vereor ne divisim scribendum sit.' Vox occurrit in Anthol. incd. ap. Dorv. ad Charit. p. 216. ed. Lips.: 'Αρτιγυνιάζων ο καλὸς καὶ στεφός ἐρεστής: 'Αρτιγυνιάς χνος occurrit Anal. Diodor. Sard. VI. Voc. ἀρτιχνος omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid.: occurrit ap. Theocriti Schol. V. 3. Περῆφος ο ἀρτιχνος ο ἥδη παγανίτης (Ecce v. παγανίτης, de qua H. Steph. III, p. 641. "Παγανίτης, et παγανίτης, Suidā teste, epitheton Jovis est i.e. barbatus"). In Theocrit. XI, 9. divisim legitur, 'Αρτὶ γυνάσδων πτερὶ τὸ στρῶμα τὰς περούφας τι. H. Steph. I, p. 844, H.: "'Ημιγύνιος, semibarbus, in v. l.' Nullum testimonium adduxit Schneid. Sed vox exstat in Theocrit. VI, 3. ο μὲν αὐτῷ Περῆφος, ο δὲ ἡμιγύνιος: ubi Schol. ἡμιγύνιος ο οὐτα πάσου γίνεν πεπληρωμένη ἔχων γενεῖν. Fallitur H. Steph. I, p. 844., cum de v. λιογύνιος scribit:—"Λιογύνιος, λεῦ mentum habens. Quem λιογύνιον a Tibullo ita describi puto, *In venis cui lævia fulgent Ora, nec amplexus aspera barba terit*; *banc enim veram esse hujus vocis significationem ap. Herodot. (V, 20.) arbitror, in Terpsich. ἄρδεις λιογύνιον vocantem: quod autem quidam interpr. λιογύνιος eum cui tenui et mollis est barba, vel qui est in prima lanugine, minime probo.*" De barba tamen J. Pollucem l. c. vocem intellexisse, manifestum est e contextu, ἀγύνιος, λιογύνιος, ιούλη νίος ὑπανθών: de barba intellexisse L. C. Valck. l. c. voc. λίως e subjuncta interpretatione patet: "Imberbis adhuc Adonis," inquit, "et λίως, prima duntaxat lanugine genas habens insignes;" de barba intellexisse Hesych. voc. λιαξ, a λίως derivatum, planum est ex ejus interpretatione: Λιαξ: πτεριγίνειος. Λιογύνιος H. Steph. vertit λεῦ mentum habens: at menti illa lævitas consistit in *tenui et molli barba*: ergo λιογύνιος, qui est in prima lanugine. Quod ad Herodoti locum attinet, *Æm. Portus in Lex. Ionic.* vertit: "Læves malas habentes, tenui mollique barba præditos, genas malas habentes."

'Mīrum est nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. vocem λίως agnoscere, de qua Hesych.: Λίως: θαδίως, διπλῶς, οφθέα, τελίως, καλῶς. (De λίως i. e.

Vox λειοκόνιτος in altero Hesychii loco non est in λειοκόνιτος mutanda, quia literarum ordo vetat (sequitur enim, λείον ὁ σῖτος, οὐ ὄμηλόν.): λειοκόνιτος· η τελείωσις, κόνις διαλελυμένη· λείως γάρ τελείως. Hæc glossa est corrupta, sed non ut doctissimi viri existimant. Vocab. λειοκόνιτος ex Hesychii manu non profectum esse, ex ipsis verbis argui potest: λειοκόνιτος· η τελείωσις, κόνις διαλελυμένη· λείως γαρ τελείως. Anne credendum est Hesych. adjectivum λειοκόνιτος exponere voluisse per nomina τελείωσις et κόνις? Credat Judæus Apella. In adiectivo λειοκόνιτος latet nomen, ad quod τελείωσις et κόνις pertinent; idque nomen forte est λειοκόνιτος, sive λειοκονίασις, quod et literarium ordo admittit. Hesychius ipse agnoscit κόνιτος: Κόνιτος· ἀσβέστωσις. (Notanda est vox ἀσβέστωσις, quam omisit H. Steph., omisit quoque Schneid.; utrumque præteriit vox ἀσβεστώης: Glossæ Labbeanæ: ".Ισθεστώης τοῖς." Verbum ἀσβεστωλαῖον agnoscit Schneid. omisit H. Steph. Eædem Glossæ: ".Ασβολαῖνεται fuscatur, P.") At dices, quid sibi velint ista verba, λειοκονίασις κόνις οἰστλ-λιμένη? Ad verba κόνις διαλελυμένη altum agunt silentium Hesychii interpretes; vox διαλελυμένη corrupta est: inter κόνις et διαλελυμένη nihil est commune: legendum ergo διακεκλυσμένη. Verbum διαλύζω et H. Steph. et Schneid. agnoscit. Κόνις διακεκλυσμένη dixit Hesych. in sensu verbi κλύζει inungere pice, cera oblinere etc., de quo Lexica H. Steph. et Schneid. silent. Hesych. Κεκόνισται πεπίσσωται, κέχλυσται. Theocritus I, 27. Καὶ βαθὺ κισσύβινον κεκλυσμένον αἴδει καρῷ, cera oblitum poculum, ubi Schol. rectissime: Κεκλυσμένον ηγουν λελουμένον κηρῷ, κεκρισμένον, οὐ κεκονισμένον οἱ κοινοὶ φασιν, ἀπὸ τοῦ κλύζω λέγεται δὲ τὸ κλύζειν, ἐπὶ δύο ἐπὶ τε τοῦ οὐαὶ κλυστῆρος λατρεύειν, καὶ ἐφ' ὑγράν, ὅταν τι ἐπέρχωνται καὶ ἐπικεκλύπτωσι, καθὼ λάγ-ται ἵνταῦθα. H. Steph. e Galeno affert ἐκκλύζω τῇ κονίᾳ, quod minus recte interpretari videtur eluere, sed Galenus præsto nobis non adest. Glossa igitur Hesych. in hunc modum forte refingenda et explicanda est: λειοκονίασις η τελείωσις, κόνις διακεκλυσμένη· λείως γάρ τελείως.¹ λειοκονίασις est

τελείως supra egimus.) Valcken. ad Albertium sic aliquando prescripsit de Hesychii glossa: "Λιίνες est φαδίος: cetera pertinent ad ἀνορίανς (v. Suid.), quæ semel juncta a Platone in Theæteto p. 144. B. ubi vid. Serran.: hæc ergo simul exposita in Lexico Platonico descriptis Hesych. sub una voce λιίνες." Locus Platonis est p. m. 107, C. ὁ δὲ οὗτος λιίνες τοι καὶ ἀπταίστας καὶ ἀνορίας ἔρχεται ἐπι τὰς μαθητας. Abreschius vocem λιίνες eruit e Basil. III. Hexaëm. p. 25. B. ὁλος ἀκριβῶς ἕπεργον, καὶ λιίνες παρηγράπτων. Nos Plutarchi afferemus locum: Λιίνες καὶ μετ' εὐγενίας προσθοται κοινωνίας τιὰ, VI, 364, 7. ed. Reiske.

¹ Hesychii etymologizæ obstare videtur, quod vox scribitur λειοκονίασις, non λειοκονίασες: nam, si vox derivaretur e v. λιίνες, scribendum esset λιίνες, non per o parvum, ut in vocibus e λίνες compositis, scribitur

proprie ἵ. q. κονία τελσία, διακεκλυσμένη, *tectorium vel calx satis oblita, et jam ad usum parata*, unde per metaphoram denotare videtur τὴν τελείωσιν. Veteres grammatici, ut et scriptores veteres ipsi, κονία et κόνις pro eodem aliquando accipiunt: Hesych. κόνις· τέφρα, σποδός: Κονία· σμῆμα, σποδός.

Nec H. Steph. nec Schneid. agnoscit κωνίω i. e. *pice inungere*. Sed lexicographos veteres, cum κωνῆσαι exponant per πιστοκοπῆσαι, de verbo κωνέω, non de v. κωνίω, vel voluisse dicere, vel debuisse, manifestum est e Schol. Aristoph., quem H. Steph. Ind. v. *Περικωνίων adduxit*: “Περικωνέω, circumcirca illino, Aristoph. Vesp. Τὸν σπόγγον ἔχων ἐκ τῆς λεκάνης τάμβαδί ήμῶν περικωνεῖ, i. e. διὰ κολακείων τὰ ὑπόδηματα ὡμῶν τῶν ὄντων ἀποψῆς καὶ ἀλειφει, inquit Schol. qui metaphoram esse dicit a vasis; proprie enim περικωνῆσαι esse τὸ πιστῶσαι τὰ κεράμια, *pice oblinere*, seu *picare vasa fictilia*. Hesych. quoque περικωνῆσαι exp. στογγίται et περιπισσῶσαι, Laco-nicum esse verbum annotans.” Idem H. Steph., (ut et Schneid.,) qui περικωνέω, circumcirca illino, agnoscit, κωνίω, (non κωνέω), *pice inungo*, recepit, quasi simplex esset κωνίω, compositum περικωνέω. Ut supra diximus, κωνᾶν est στριφέων, περισύνεν, περιενεγκέν, at κωνεῖν, quod verbum Lexicis est commendandum, est πιστῶσαι. Hesych. non dicit: κωνεῖν πιστοκοπεῖν καὶ κύκλῳ περιφέρειν: sed κωνῆσαι πιστοκοπῆσαι, καὶ κύκλῳ περιενεγκεῖν: codemque modo nec Etym. M. nec Suidas habet κωνεῖν, sed tantum κωνῆσαι: hoc κωνῆσαι, ambigue dictum, H. Steph. et Schneid. accipiunt pro aor. a v. κωνίω, cum est a κωνέω, ut patet ex Aristoph. περικωνεῖ, et ejus Schol. Κωνῖν, i. e. *pice inungere*, e Lexicis expellendum est. Schneiderus: “Πιστοκωνέω ich verpiche, auch πιστοκωνέω oder πιστοκωνάω” H. Steph. Thes. III, p. 330.: “Πιστοκωνάω, *pice oblinio*, seu *circumlino*.” Πιστοκωνάω est vox nihili: scribe, πιστοκωνέω. Notandum est Salmasium in nota infra laudanda rectissime scribere κωνεῖν, non κωνᾶν. Verbum ἐκκωνεῖν non agnoscunt H. Steph. et Schneid. Sed exstat in corrupta Hesychii glossa: ‘Ἐκκονεῖ ἐγχωρεῖ: ubi male egit Heins.:’ “Ισως, ‘Ἐκκυνεῖ’ ἐγχωρεῖ: nam οἱ ἐγχωροῦντες h. e. πλανάντες inter venandum, ἐκκυνοὶ Χενοφ. Cyneg., τελευτῶσαι, inquit, γίνονται ἐκκυνοὶ, πενηρὸν πάθημα:” optime restituit J. Voss. legendo, ‘Ἐκκωνεῖ’ ἐγχρίει.

λεικόγεντος, non λεικόγυτος: λεικόνιτος, non λεικόνιτος. Literarum series nos vetat h. l. λεικονίατος scribere, quia sequens glossa est: Λιον· ἐστις ἡ ὄμωλός. An λιον in λεικονίατος pertineat ad τὸ λιον, qui H. Stephano in v. est *pulvis* Aristot. 4. De Hist. Anim., et Salmasio in Solin. p. 868. A. i. q. *tectorium* (‘*Livum parietis a p. Jurisconsultum pro tectorio*, τὸ λιον, ut olim docuimus describendum pro *rivum*), alii viderint.

‘Nescio qua auctoritate fretus Hesychius “Laconicum esse verbum annotet;” nam et Aristophanes eo usus est.

Græcos scriptores non modo κωνεῖν, περικωνεῖν, i. e. pice intungere; usurpasse, sed et κωνίζειν eodem dixisse sensu, abunde testantur Hesychii loca supra adducta.

Infia a Salmasio demonstrabitur eosdem et κωνίζειν et κωνίζειν uno eodemque dixisse sensu. Inde fit, ut in uno Hesychii loco sit scriptum πιστοκωνία, in altero autem πιστοκωνία: Hesych. v. κωνῆσαι scribit: Πιστοκωνία ἡ νῦν πισιδία (πιστία), ἢ χύλωσι τὰ παρισθμά τῶν προβάτων, ubi Albertius male legit πιστοκωνία: nam Hesych. h. l. scripsisse πιστοκωνία, manifestum est e præcedentibus verbis, ubi Aeschylus φρέστιν affert, πιστοκόνιτον μόρον. Idem tamen Hesychius in altero loco habet: Πιστοκωνίας, Ἡρόδοτος πιστοκωνίαν εἶπεν, διὰ τὰ πρόβατα πίση χρίεσθαι.¹ Vocem πιστοκωνία, sive πιστοκωνία, omisit H. Steph. De ea Schneiderus: "Πιστοκωνία, auch πιστοκωνία, das verpielen, von πίσσα, pech, u. κῶνος, flüssiges pech, oder κονία, wie ἀμφοκονία, δοτραχοκονία."

Vel Theocritus I, 30. κεκονισμένος usurpavit pro κεκωνισμένος:

Τῷ περὶ μὲν χείλη μαρίσται ὑψόθι κισσὸς.

Κισσὸς ἐλιχρυσῷ κεκονισμένος:

optime exposuit Salmas. loco infra laudando: "Hedera poculum illud ambiebat per extremas oras; quæ hedera lita auripigmento fuit, ut κισσὸς χρυσόκαρπος; exprimeretur." Bene Schol. Κονία, ἡ ἀσβεστος, ἀφ' οὗ κονίαν κονίω, τὸ ἀσβέστῳ χρίω, καὶ κεκονισμένος τοίχος, ὁ ἀσβέστῳ κεχριωμένος, ἵταῦθα δὲ τὸ κεκονισμένος, ἵτως ἀντὶ τοῦ κεχρισμένος ἀπλώς, ἀπὸ τοῦ κεκονισμένος κατὰ συγκοπὴν. Cetera accuratus, fallitur Schol. credens κεκονισμένος ponit pro κεκονισμένος, κατὰ συγκοπὴν, cum revera ponitur pro κεκωνισμένος. "Κονίω sive κονίω, oblico, proprie oblico pulvere, χρίω, ut Suid. exponit: at Hesychio κεκονισμένος sunt λευκαίνοντες, albario opere, seu calce inducentes: item pico, pice oblico: unde ἀκόνιτος Dioscoridi ἀπίστωτος: pro χρίω autem accipi videtur Scholiastæ Theocriti Id. I. (l. c.)." H. Steph. Thes. II, 335, F. Fallitur H. Steph., cum putet κονίω sive κονίω esse proprie oblico pulvere, deinde generatim oblico, χρίω. Κονίω usurpatum pro oblico pulvere, qui H. Stephano hujus vocis primarius sensus est, nondum invenimus. Κονίω, cum a κόνις, pulvis, originem trahat, notat pulvere impleo, respergo, fredo: at, cum pro κονίω, ponatur, nihil ei commune est cum vocabulo κόνις, i. e. pulvis, sed omnes habet sensus, qui verbo κονίω insunt, sc. pice oblico, cera

¹ Ubi Albertius:—"In Herodoto locum frustra quæres; nec alibi vocem me legere memini. Quum vero Grammaticum redoleat hic articulus pro Ἡρόδοτος; leg. suspicor Ἡρόδων, quem inter nobiliores Homeri interpres cum Apione sèpius junctum laudat Eustath.; vel Ἡρόδιαν, de quo in Epist. ad Eulogium, huic libro præmissa. Herodoti enim, Herondori, ac Herodiani nomina non raro in libris confusa esse, norunt satis eruditæ, quod multis exemplis comprobavit P. Wesselung. in Diss. Herodot. c. 3, et 4."

oblino, generatim **oblino**, et **χρίω**. Utrum **κονίω** pro **κωνίω** idem sibi vindicet etymon, quod **κωνίω**, a **κῶνος**, **pix**, an sit e **κόνις**, **pulvis**, alii viderint. Glossæ Labbeanæ: **Κόνις**: **ciner**, **cinis**, **pulvis**, **lis**, **lixivum**. Sed scribit Salmas. in Solin. p. 868. “Ut igitur **κονίσται** pro **κωνίσται**, ita **κονία** pro **κωνία**, ή **χρίσις**, quo sensu et **calx** ita dicitur, quo linebant et inducebant parietes: nulla in hac voce **cineris**, aut **lixivi** significatio, ut vulgo sibi persuadent harum literarum imperiti.” At, quanquam Salmasio demus in “voce **κωνία**, sive **κονία**, nullam esse **cineris**, aut **lixivi** (i. e. **κόνεως**) significationem,” tamen non continuo sequitur vocem **κόνις** nunquam accipi debere pro **κωνία**, sive **κωνία**, i. e. **χρίσις**, et verb. **κονίζειν** pro **κωνίζειν**, i. e. **oblinere**, nequicquam venire a **κόνις** i. e. **pulvis**, Supra vidimus Hesych. et **κόνι**; et **κονία** exponere per **σποδός**, et si **κόνις** et **κονία** accipiantur pro eadem re sc. **σποδός**, cur non **κόνις**, i. e. **pulvis**, aliquando per errorem pro **κονία**, sive **κωνία**, i. e. **calx**, **χρίσις**, putemus? Salmas. l. c. aliter sentit:—“**Κονία**, cum **calcem** significat, τὸν **κονίασιν**, vel **χρίσιν** proprie, h. c. tectorium denotat, quod diversæ est notionis et originis quam **κονία**, quæ cinerem, vel σταχιὴν designat, unde et **κόνις**, **pulvis**, **cinis**.” J. N. Niclas ad Geponica XI, 20, 3. sic scribit:—“**Κονία** et **κόνις** est **pulvis**, **calx**, unde **κονία** et **κονίζω**, **calce illino**, **pulvere spargo**: **κόνις** vero est **strobilus**, **pix**, unde **κωνίω**, **pice ungo**. Neque vero Theocritus κεκονισμένην posuit pro κεκανισμένην, ut vult Salmas.: nam κεκανισμένη ibi est **pulvere auripigmenti sparsum**, ab **κόνις**, **pulvis**, non a **κώνος**, **pix**.” Quod ad Theocriti locum attinet, nostram sententiam, cuius auctor est Salmasius, supra declaravimus. Fallitur Niclas, qui censeat **κονίω** et **κωνίω** nihil inter se commune habere: nam modo demonstravimus **κονίω** interdum occurrere in sensu τοῦ **κωνίω**, et hoc luce clarior fecit Salmas. in loco, ad quem Niclas respicit, et quenam fugientibus oculis legisse videtur.

Sed totus Niclasii locus notatu dignus est:—“Geponica XI, 20, 3. εἰς ἀγγεῖα κεράμια νέα ἀκόνιστα, τουτέστιν ἀπίστωτα: Ἀκόνιτα conjecterat v. d. ad marginem Fabricianum; sed hoc nimis recedit a vulgaræ lectionis similitudine; itaque malim ἀκόνιστα. Κῶνος est **pix liquida**: Diosc. I, 94. Πίσσα ή μὲν ὑγρὰ, ήν ἔνοι κῶνον καλοῦσιν: inde κῶνα in Glossis Iatricis MSS. Neophyti ap. Dufresnium eadem significatione. A κῶνος duo formantur verba, κωνάω, unde κωνῆσαι, *instar* turbinis convertere, et κωνίω, *pice inungo*.: Hesych. Διακωνήσαι δικχλαῖσαι (f. διακλύσαι) ἀπὸ τοῦ κωνήσαι, ὅπερ ἐστιν, πίσση χρίσαι: ubi vid. vv. dd. Idem Hesych. Κεκάνισται πεπίστωται, κέκλισται. Inde igitur ἀκόνιστος, ex quo librarii imperiti tanto facilius ἀκόνιστος facere potuerunt, quoniam non modo alias quoque οὐ et ὡ permutant, ut κούφος et κάφος, de quo Valcken. Anim. ad Ammon. p. 134., sed etiam quod ἀκόνιστος, καύνισμα, κουνισμένος, etc. verba sunt barbaræ Græciæ familiarissima,

pro movere, quaterc, vacillare, titubare, a κόνια, cinc, vannus, etc.
Nunc demum video Salmas. ad Solin. p. 868. ἀκόνιστα emendasse.
Nam nostrum locum ab eo designari non dubito. Ipse loquatur :
'Græci posteriores κονίαν pro κωνίᾳ dixerunt—codem sensu dixerunt
et κωνίζειν, et pro eo κονίζειν : in Geoponicis, ἐν ἀκονίστῳ πίθῳ, του-
τέστιν ἀπίστρωτῳ, quod pice non est oblitum.' Hoc maneat itaque
aut legendum esse ἀκόνιστα : nam οὐ et οὐ quam sæpe permutentur,
vix dici potest : cf. Casaub. ad Athen. II, 5. et criticos ad Hesych.
vv. ἐπιβουλεύει et συμβουλεύει : aut ἀκόνιστα, quod aliae suadent ra-
tiones : nempe nomina et verba sunt diversa : κονία et κόνις est pulvis,
calx, unde κονία et κονίζω, calce illino, pulvere spargo. Κάνος vero
est strobilus, pix, unde κωνίζω, pice ungō. Neque vero Theocritus
κεκονισμένον posuit pro κεκονισμένον, ut vult Salmas. ; nam κεκονισ-
μένον ibi est pulvri auripigmenti sparsum, ab κόνις, pulvis, non a
κῶνις, pix.' Utrum in Gepon. legas cum Salmasio ἀκόνιστα, an
cum Niclasio ἀκόνιστα, an cum Needhamo ἀκάνητα, nihil interest :
sensus est idem : sed Salmasiana lectio ἀκόνιστα præferenda est,
quoniam, ut erudite et accurate observat Salmas. l. c., Græci pos-
teriores κονίαν pro κωνίᾳ, et κονίζειν pro κωνίζειν dixerent.

Schneid. in Lex. v. ἀκόνιτος : "Nicht verpicht oder mit Pech
überzogen, (wo wir unsre irldene Gefäße glasiren) Diosc. I, 94.
not. Sar. sollte eigentl. ἀκάνιστος, von κωνίζω, κῶνος no. 5. heissen.
S. ἀκόνιττος nach." In v. ἀκάνιστος scribit : "S. v. a. ἀκόνιτος,
Gepon. XI, 20. S. κωνίζω nach." H. Steph. Thes. II, p. 335, F. :
"'Ακόνιτος; Dioscoridi ἀπίστρωτος.'

Fallitur Nielas, dicens "a κώνος duo formari verba κωνάω, unde
κωνῆσαι, instar turbinis convertere, et κωνίζω, pice inungo." Ver-
bum κωνάω, instar turbinis convertō, venit non a κώνος, quæ est,
teste Diosc. I, 94., πίσσα υγρὰ, (unde ap. Hesych. Κωνῆσαι πι-
σσοκοπῆσαι) sed a κώνᾳ, quæ est, teste Hesychio, βέμβιξ, unde ap.
eund. Κωνᾶγε περιδινεῖν : Κωνῆσαι κύκλῳ, περιενεγκεῖν : Περικωνῆσαι
περιφομβῆσαι, περιγαγχεῖν : 'Εκώνγ. ἔστρεψεν, pro ἔκωνα a κωνάω :.
'Ανακωνᾶγεν ἀναστρέψειν: legebatur h. l. ἀνακονεῖν, bene suspectum H.
Steph. Ind. Thes. utpote non sua serie positum ; vv. dd. recte cor-
rigunt ἀνακωνᾶγεν, quod verbum Lexicis est addendum. A κώνᾳ, i. e.
βέμβιξ, venit κωνάξω, κωνάξω, Doribus, unde Epicharmi σκυ-
φοκωνάκτος τοῖς σκύφοις περιφόρητος ap. Hesych. : verbum κωνάξω
omiserunt H. Steph. et Schneid.: H. Steph. omisit σκυφοκω-
νάκτος, quod Schneid. notavit in v. κωνάω, sed in proprio loco
omisit: omiserunt quoque περικωνᾶγεν i. e., ut modo diximus,
περιεμβῆσαι.

Ut Græci posteriores dicebant κωνίζω pro κωνίζω, κονία pro κωνίᾳ,
ἀκόνιστος pro ἀκάνιστος, sic "κόνιον pro κώνειον in Epigr. Diogenis, ut
scriptum est in antiquissimo codice,

πρὸς γάρ ἑθναῖαν κόνιον μὲν ἀπλῶς σὺ ἐδέξω,
αὐτοὶ δὲ ἐξέπιον τοῦτο τεῷ στόματι,

de Socrate; ita etiam legit Suidas." Salmas. in Solin. p. 868. Q. Suidæ locus est: Κόνειον βοτάνη δηλητήριος, διὰ τοῦ ο μικροῦ διὰ τὸ μέτρον τοῦ στίχου: ubi Kusterus monet: "Vel ex serie literarum patet, Suidam scribere voluisse, vel debuisse, κόνιον, per i." Diogenes κόνιον non usurpasset metri tantum gratia, ut Suidas existimatbat, si, in isto Græcitatibus inferioris saeculo, κόνιον potius quam κάνειον non frequentassent scriptores. Κόνιον pro κάνειον omisit H. Steph., sed habet Schneid.: "Κόνιον, s. v. a κάνειον, Schierling, cicuta; bey Diog. Laert. II, 46. lesen die Handschr. u. Suidas, Πρὸς γὰρ Ἀθηναίων κόνιον μὲν ἀπλᾶς σὺ έδέξω, wo jetzt κάνειον ἀπλᾶς μὲν ἔδ. steht." In Epigrammate nihil est mutandum. Glossæ iatricæ MSS. Κόνιον κηκοῦτα, i. e. cicuta: fallitur Albertius, qui mutat in κάνειον.¹ Græci dicebant κάνειον, κάνιον, κανεῖα eodem sensu: κάνιον et κανεῖα omisit H. Steph.: κανεῖα omisit Schneid., sed agnoscit κάνειον, et κάνιον. Hesych. Κανεῖαν πότες εἶδος: Κάνιον δηλητήριον, ἦτοι θανάσιμον, βοτάνη, h. l. κάνιον pro κάνειον literarum ordo postulat, ut vidit J. Voss. J. Pollux VIII, 71. de carnifice: Τὰ δὲ ἐργαλεῖα αὐτοῦ ξίφος, βρόχος, τύμπανον, φάρμακον, κάνειον: leg. κάνιον: "Mss. κάνιον," Jung.: iterum J. Pollux V, 132. τὸ γὰρ κάνειον κατὰ Φύξιν ὄνταιρε: ubi Jung. "Ms. κόνιον," quod notandum potius quam ejiciendum.

Supra vidimus κάνιος esse, teste Dioscor. I, 94., πίτσα ὑγρὰ, unde ap. Hesych. Κανῆσαι πισσοκοπῆσαι. De v. κάνιος pro πίτσα ὑγρὰ, silet H. Steph., ut et Schneid. Κάνιος proprie est ὁ στρόβιλος, πυρ pinea, tum nucleus nucis pineae, ὁ τῆς πίτσας καρπός. Hesych. Κάνοι· στρόβιλοι: Κάνον, i. τῆς πίτσας καρπὸς, καὶ στρόβιλος: Κανοφόρον στροβιλοφόρον. Homeri Vita c. 20., notante Pergero: Πλανώμενος ἀπίκετο εἰς τὸ χωρίον, ὁ Ηίτιος καλεῖται κάνταῦθα αὐτῷ ἀναπαυομένων τὴν νύκτα ἐπιπίπτει καρπὸς τῆς πίτσας, ἐν ᾧ μετεξέτεροι Στρόβιλον, οἱ δὲ Κάνον καλέουσιν. Glossæ Labbeanæ: "Κάνιος nucleus: Κάνοις nuclei: Κανοφόρος cunifer." Docte scripsit Gesnerus Thes. L. L.: "Conus primo dictus videtur a Græcis fructus s. nux cupressorum, piceæ, et similiūm arborum, quæ inde coniferæ dicuntur: etiam Colum. VI, 7, 2. conos cupressinos vocat; galbulos R. R. I, 40, 1. Serv. ad Virg. Aen. III, 680. 'Et conus dicitur fructus cupressi, et ipsa κανοειδῆς est; nam a rotunditate in acumen levatur.'" Ex his κάνοις quia pix liquida fluebat, vox κάνιος, progressu temporis,

¹ Hesych. Ἐλάφιον κάνιον: H. Steph. in v. h. l. affert. Nomen ἐλάφιον (proprie adjectivum, nomine subintellecto), omisit Schneid., ut et nom. ἴφημιστον eodem sensu. Hesych. Ἐφίμιον τὸ κάνιον: ubi Albertius:—"Vid. Etym. M. v. Κάνιον et Salmas. Exerc. Plin. p. 171.: sic Φάρμακον ἴφημιστον ap. Plut. Themist. p. 128. A., quod A. Gell. vi. 4. venenum præsentaneum vocat: cf. Gatak. ad M. Antonin. IV, 48. p. 132."

surpabatur pro pice liquida, ut ap. Diosc. I, 94. Bene scribit Phot. Lex. Ms. ad v. Κῶνης: Κάνους καλοῦσι τοὺς στροβίλους εἰκότως καὶ οἱ πιπτοῦντες τὰ ἄγγεια, ἀπὸ τῆς περιαγωγῆς, οὐκ ἀπὸ τῆς πιπτώσεως. Per στροβίλους h. l. intelligendi sunt *coni*,¹ ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός.

E voce κῶνος, i. e. ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός, nomen suum traxit κωνίας εῖνος: Galenus Gloss. Hippocr.: Κωνιαν οίνον τὸν πιστίτην ἐσβάλλεται σὺν τῷ φλοιῷ τῆς πεύκης ἡμικοτύλιον εἰς τὸ κεράμειον, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπτηνοῦσι μετὰ τὸ ζέσαι, οἱ δὲ καταλείπουσιν.

E voce κῶνος, i. e. ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός, venit κῶνος i. e. ὁ θύρσος. Hesych. Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι. Suidas: Κωνοφόροι θυρσοφόροι κῶνος δὲ λέγεται ὁ βοτρυοειδῆς τοῦ στροβίλου καρπός, ὃν ἔφερον αἱ γυναικεῖς βαστάζουσαι ἐν ταῖς τοῦ Διονύσου τελεταῖς, ἐπειδὴ ὅμοιον τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κῶνου τῇ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου καρδίᾳ, ἐπιτιτάγη δὲ φασιν "Ελληνες τῆς τῶν ἀνθράκων καρδίας τὸν Διόνυσον οικείων οὐν τινὶ μιστηρίῳ τούτῳ ἐπολουν. Schol. MSS. Cod. Moden. in Clem. Alex. Προτρ. p. 15. (ap. Bast. Gregor. p. 241.) Κῶνοι οἱ στροβίλοι, καὶ οἱ θύρσοι, ὡς Διογενιανὸς, ρόμβος, ἔνος: Κῶνος ἔυλάριον, οὐ ἔξηπται τὸ σπαρτίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς ἰδονεῖτο, ἵνα ροιξῇ. τὸ δὲ αὐτὸν καὶ ρόμβος ἐκαλεῖτο· αὕτω Διογενιαγός. Hic Scholiastes hortulos suos irrigavit ex ecdeum flumine, quod libavit Hesych.: Ἡρόμβος· ψύρος, στρόφος, ἥχος, οἴνος, κῶνος, ἔυλάριον, οὐ ἔξηπται σχοινίον, καὶ ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς δινεῖται. (H. l. Albertus bene retinet ἔυλάριον, de qua voce H. Steph. II, 1142.

Fallitur H. Steph., qui in v. Κῶνος scribit: "Κῶνοι, ut et στρομβοὶ et στρόβιλοι, dicuntur turbines illi, quibus pueri ludunt, alio nomine βίμβης dicti." Eodem modo J. N. Niclas erravit, quem supra notavimus. Κῶνα est βίμβη, non κῶνος: Hesych. Κῶνα βεμβεξ. H. Steph. ad sequentem Hesychii glossam respicit, quam mirum est non intellexisse: Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι, καὶ στροβίλοι, καὶ οἱ στρομβοὶ. Per στροβίλους; καὶ στρόμβους intelligi debet ὁ τῆς πίτυος καρπός. Schol. ad Theocr. Idyll. V, 49. ἡ πίτυς δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ὑψους στροβίλους ἀφίσιν. Hesych.: Κύτταροι καὶ τὰ τῆς πίτυης καὶ πίτυος προσανθυντα στροβίλαι: cf. H. Steph. in v. Κύτταρος. (Notanda est vox στροβίλοι, quod omisit H. Steph.: occurrit ap. J. Poll. V, 97., sed alio sensu: Ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ παρὰ τοῖς Κωμαρδοῖς, καὶ ἕγκλαστροῖς, καὶ στροβίλαις, καὶ βοτρύδαις: ubi Jung.: "Sc. quod similia essent τῷ τῆς πίτυος καρπῷ, τοῖς λυγομίνοις (uti ex Etymologo patet in φεύγει) στροβίλοις, et Hesych. στροβίλοι inter alia explicat ιδος γυναικίων κρυσταῖς.") "Στρομβος i. q. κῶνος, vel στρόβιλος: Hesych. Κῶνοι οἱ θύρσοι καὶ οἱ στροβίλοι, καὶ οἱ στρόμβοι. Nicander (Ther. 883.) στρόμβους etiam posuit pro nucibus pineis, qui et κῶνος proprie:

οὐδὲ οὔσα πεύκαι

ἀγροτίκαι στρόμβουσιν ὑπερέχαστο ναπαλαις,

ad quem locum Schol. exponit στρόμβον, τὸν κανονιδῆ καρπὸν τῆς πίτυης." Salmas. in Solin. p. 907. Cf. H. Steph. Thes. III, p. 1106. F. Est sensus astronomicus vocis κῶνος, quem non notavit H. Steph. Suidas Κῶνοι στροβίλοι, καὶ τὸ ἀστροκίνημα τῆς γῆς.

C. dubitaverat, sed quæ omnino defendi possit e ξυλάριον Scholiastæ modo citati.)

Notandus est magnus veterum grammaticorum, ut Hesych. et Schol. in Clem. Alex. ll. cc., error, qui κῶνον in Bacchi ritibus usurpatum cum ῥόμβῳ ad eosdem ritus adhibito confundunt. Κῶνος est ὁ θύρσος, at ῥόμβος non est ὁ θύρσος, sive κῶνος. Κῶνος ut Suidas l. c. optime explicat, est fructus pini, racemum figura referens, quem mulieres in sacris Bacchi gestabant in pertica summa fixum, ut patet ex Epigrammatis versu, quem adduxit Suidas :

Kαὶ θύρσου χλωερὸν κωνοφόρον κάμακα.

Pertica illa nihil aliud erat quam κλάδος, unde in Epigr. χλωερὸν κάμακα: hinc θύρσος explicatur κλάδος: Suidas, Θύρσος: βακχικὴ ῥάβδος. Hesych. Θύρσος ῥάβδος, βακτηρία βακχικὴ, ἡ κλάδος: Θύρσος κλάδοι. Proprie θύρσος est κλάδος, sive χλωερὸς κάμακ κωνοφόρος: improprie ergo sumitur κῶνος pro θύρσος, id quod revera in pertica fixum pro pertica ipsa. Sed ῥόμβος de iisdem Bacchi ritibus usurpatus longe alio dicitur sensu quam κῶνος, sive θύρσος.

Ἐνθεν εἰσαὶται

ῥόμβῳ καὶ τυπάνῳ Ρεῖην Φρύγες ιλάσκονται:

Apoll. R. I. 1139.

¹ De θύρσοι insignis est Salmasii Epistola, ad Du Puy. A. 1628. scripta, ubi idem epitheton κωνοφόρος θύρσος ex Orpheo versu ap. Clem. Alex. "Je vous renvoie la lettre de Monsr. Peyresc, et vous en remercie, comme je luy fais pour les remarques de l'antiquité, qu'il a daigné rechercher si curieusement à mon subject. Quant aux *Thyrses Bacchiques*, il faut nécessairement qu'il y en ait eu de deux sortes, et les Autheurs anciens en marquent la difference. Les uns estoient tout entortillés de papier et de feuilles de lierre; Anacreon les appelle καταλόρροις θύρσοι, i. e. *hedera inductos thyrsos*. Il s'en voit de cette façon dans l'Agathe gravée, qui est aut devant du *Perse de Casaubon*, et dans son livre *De Salyra*, et qui est expliquée par Scaliger en l'une de ses Epistles. Elle a pour argument les mystères ou orgies de Bacchus, et une bacchante y tient un thyrse, fait en la façon que je dis. C'est un baton simple qui a dulierre à l'entour. En quelques uns le bout du javelot estoit enveloppé de feuilles de vigne ou de lierre, et en ce sens Macrobi interprète *thyrum, hustam, vel jaculum, cuius mucro hedera lambente obtectus est*. Les Grecs les appellent λογχατοὺς θύρσους, ou θυρολόγχους. Quant aux autres remarques par le dit Sr. Peyresc, c'estoient des batons au bout desquels il y avoit une pomme de pin, qui estoit entre les jouëts de Bacchus, comme il se voit dans un vers d'Orphée chez Clement Alexandrin, où entre les jouëts de Bacchus estant encore enfant il nomme κέρνον, qui sont des pommes de pin; et de la vient que les Bacchantes les portoient au bout de leurs batons, qu'ils appelloient θύρσος, κωνοφόρος. Pexpliqueray cela en mes Prolegomenes." Salmasii Epist. XII. Lib. I. Confer Plin. Exercit. in Solin. p. 908. De Homonym. Hyles Iatr. p. 3, 5.

ubi Schol. Ῥόμβος δέ ἔστι τροχίσκος, ὃν στρέφουσιν ιμᾶσι τύπτοντες, καὶ οὕτω κτύπον ἀποτελλόσιν: Phot. Lex. Ms. Ῥόμβος, ὃν ἔχουσιν οἱ ἀποθεμάζοντες, ὡς τὸ τύμπανον: Archytas H. Steph. Excerpt. p. 84. Καὶ τοῖς ρόμβοις, τοῖς ἐν ταῖς τελεταῖς κινουμένοις τὸ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει· ἔσυχα μὲν κινούμενοι βαρὺν ἀφίεντι ἄχον, ισχυρῷς δὲ ὅξεν. Viri doc-tissimi, ut ostendemus alibi in peculiari Dissertatione de v. Ῥόμβος ejusque multiplici sensu, *rhombum sacrum confundunt et cum magico rhombo* (de quo Theocritus), et *cum puerorum turbine*, ab Homero et vetustioribus scriptoribus στρόμβῳ, et a posterioribus demum Græcis ρόμβῳ, appellato. In Epigrammate, ad quod allusit Suidas, scriptor rectissime distinguit ρόμβον, θύρσον, et κῶνον. Kusterus ad Suid. v. Θίασος e Ms. edidit:

Στρεπτὸν Βασταρικοῦ ἕγμβην θάσοιο μύωπα,
καὶ σκύλης ἀμφιδόρου στιχτὸν ἀχαινεω,
καὶ Κορυβαντείων ιαχήματα χάλκεα ρόπτρων,
καὶ θύρσου χλωρεὸν κανοφόρον καμάκα,
καὶ κορύφωιο βαρὺν τυπάνου βρόμον, ἡδὲ φορηθὲν
πολλάκι μιτροδότου λίκνον ὑπερβε νόμης,
Εύάνθη Βάκχῳ τὴν ἔντρομον, ἀνίκα θύρσοις
ἀτρομον εἰς προπόσεις χείρα μετημφίασεν.

Addit Kusterus:—“Evanthe Baccho dedicat instrumenta, quibus antea in celebrandis Dei illius orgiis usa fuerat, veluti *rhombum*, *thyrum*, *pellem cervinam*, *vannum*, et *tympanum*.” In v. *Βρά-mos pro καὶ κορύφωιο* Suidas habet καὶ *κούρποι*.

Salmasii locus, quem sæpenumero supra laudavimus, est hic:—“Observanda differentia *albarii* operis et *tectorii*: *tectorium* fit harenata calce, vel marmorato; *albarium* calce mera. Vitruvius, *Tectorio*, sive *albario* *opere*. Et alio loco *album opus* appellat. Inde *albini* et *albarii*, qui dealbant. Proprium verbum hujus operis *dealbare*, ut *tectorii linere* et *polire*. Græci κονιατάς vocant *τὰν* *albarios*, quam *tectores*. Hesych.: κονιώντες: λευκάνινοντες: καὶ κονιαταί ἀτβεστωταί καὶ χρῖται: item, κονιατις: ἀτβεστωτις; Lat. *decalcatio*. Ita enim veteres loquuti: Festus: *Calecatu σεδίσια, calce polita, κεκονικμένα, ἀτβεστωμένα*: item, *decalcatum, calce litum*. Ita in vetustissimo libro scriptum reperi. Kovia,

¹ Hesychius ipse habet non ἀτβεστωταί, sed ἀτβεστήσεις: neutrum agnoscunt H. Steph. et Schneid.; an recte omittant, alii viderint: de Salmasiana lectione ἀτβεστωταί silet Albertius, sed de v. χρῖται scribit: “L. χρῖται: Glossa, χρῖστης ὁ κονιατης, tector.” Nec χρῖται, nec χρῖτης agnoscit H. Steph.: de v. χρῖτη silet Schneid., sed ε Glossis habet χρῖτης. Voc. διάχειρις a Salmasio infra memoratum non habent H. Steph. et Schneid.

vetustis Glossis *calx* exponitur. Item in Græcis: Κονία. ἀσβεστος. Sed κονία cum *calcem* significat, τὴν κονίασιν vel χρήσιν proprie, h. e. *tectorium* denotat. Quod diversæ est notionis et originis quam κονία, quæ *cinerem*, vel σταχτὴν designat, unde et κόνις, *pulvis*, *cinis*. At κονία pro *tectorio* vel *calce* i. q. χρήσις. Unde κατάχριστοι τοῖχοι, *tectorio inducti parietes*, et νωκαὶ τάχριστοι, *recens dealbati* ap. Dioscor. Ad eam rem præcipuus usus calcis. Κονίαν veteres dicebant, quod est διάχρισιν. Nam et κάνειν, pro χρίειν. Unde πιστοκανῆσαι, *pice lincre*, et πιστοκανῆσθαι μόρῳ ap. Aeschylum, ὅταν πιστη χαταχρισθέντες τινὲς ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀποθνήσιν. Inde κάνησις ap. Aristotelem in alveis apum, quam alii κόπια μωσιν dicebant. Grammatici exponunt διάχρισιν τοῦ σμήνους. Ex eo ἀκόνητον ἀγγεῖον ap. Dioscor. *vas non picatum*. Ita enim leg. de fuligine resinæ: εἰς κεφαλεῦν ἀγγεῖον ἀκόνητον, τούτεστιν ἀπίσσωτον. Et ap. Suid. κάνησαι πίθον, *picare dolium*. Græci posteriores κονίαν pro κάνηαν dixerunt. Sic κόνιον pro κάνειν in Epigr. Diogenis, ut scriptum est in antiquissimo Codice:

πρὸς γὰρ Ἀθηναίων κόνιον μὲν ἀπλῶς σὺ ἐδέξω,
αὐτοὶ δὲ ἔξεπιον τοῦτο τεῷ στόματι,

de Socrate: ita etiam legit Suidas. Πιστοκανία ap. Herod., ἡ διὰ πιστης χρήσις: alii πιστοκονίαν vocarunt per o parvum. Hesych. πιστοκονία ἡ νῦν πιστία, δι' ἣς χρίουσι τὰ παρίσθμια τῶν προβάτων. Eodem sensu dixerunt et κανίζειν, et pro eo κονίζειν. In Geoponicis, ἐν ἀκονίστῳ πίθῳ, τούτεστιν ἀπίσσωτῳ, *quod pice non est oblitum*. Hesych. κεκάνισται πεπίσσωται, κεκλυσται: Theocr. κεκόνισμένου posuit pro κεκανισμένῳ:

Κισσὸς ἐλιχρύσῳ κεκανισμένος.

Qui versus longe aliter exponendus, ac vulgo interpretes accipiunt. Hedera poculum illud ambiebat per extremas oras. Quæ hedera lita auripigmento fuit, ut κισσὸς χρυσόκαρπος exprimeretur. Ἐλιχρυσος, auripigmentum: Hesych. ἐλιχρυσος, οἱ μὲν τὸ ἀρσενικὸν, οἱ δὲ τὸ ἄνθης ἐλιχρύσου βοτάνης. Quod autem Hesych. κεκόνισται, κεκλυσται interpretatur, in hac eadem significatione posuit Theocritus: κισσύβιν κεκλυσμένον ἀδεὶ καρῷ, *cera oblitum poculum*. Ut igitur κονίσαι pro κάνησαι, ita κονία pro κωλίᾳ, ἡ χρήσις. Quo sensu et calx ita dicitur, quo linebant et inducebant parietes. Nulla in h. v. *cineris*, aut *lixivi* significatio, ut vulgo sibi persuadent harum literarum imperiti." Salmas. in Solin. p. 868.

E supra dictis liquido patet, Valckenærium falli, cum Salmasium corrigere velit, ad Theocritum I, 30. *Κισσὸς ἐλιχρύσῳ κεκονισμένος*, his verbis:—"Hunc locum tractans Salmasius in Solin. p. 1229, A. κονίειν, vel κονίζειν, et κονίζῃ, vel κανιζῃ, diversa confudit. Vera est observatio Eustathii in Hom. Il. γ. p. 289, 38. (et in Il. γ. p. 1153, 19.): "Ομηρος μὲν κονίην λέγει τὴν ἀπλῶς κόνιν" οἱ δὲ μεθ'

"Ομηρον, τὴν τίτανον ἔξ ής καὶ ἐλαιοκονία σύρχεται· καὶ βῆμα γίνεται—
κονίῳ κονιάσω· ἔξ οὐ καὶ τοῖχος κεκονιαμένος. Κονίζειν est pulverem ad-
sperrere; κονιάν, calce illinere: de Templo Neptuni, cuius parie-
tes erant interiores calce dealbati, κεκονιάται τὰ ἑντὸς, inquit Pau-
san. X, p. 892, I. Τοῖχοι κεκονισμένοι parietes essent pulvere con-
spersi. Sed amplificatam verbi vim quomodocunque adspergendi
voces adjectæ determinant: hoc in loco, κισσὸς ἐλιξιόνω κεκονισ-
μένος, est hedera auri pigmento vclut adspersa exornata." Non
Salmasius ipse, ut critico summo videtur, sed Græci recentiores,
ut Salmasius, et nos post Salmasium plurimis exemplis ostendimus,
κονίειν et κονίζειν. κονιάν et κονιάζειν confuderunt.

Fr. Guil. Sturzius de Dial. Maced. et Alex. p. 175., quod mi-
rum est, nullam Valckenærianæ notæ mentionem fecit, recte tamen
et κονίειν et κονίζειν pro χρίειν usurpatum recentiori tribuit Græci-
tati, ut ante Sturzium fecerat Salmasius, cuius locus eum præte-
riit. "Κονίειν sive κονίζειν, ubi simpliciter pro χρίειν dictum fuit,
non tulit Gr. linguae puritas. Schol. Theocr. ad I, 27. κεκλυσμένον,
ἥγουν λελουμένον, κεχρισμένον, ὁ κεκονισμένον οἱ κοινοί φασιν: deinde ad
v. 30., ubi poeta κεκονισμένος ἵστι τοῦ κεχρισμένος ἀπλῶς."

REMARKS ON

POETÆ MINORES GRÆCI, *Præcipua Lectionis Varietate
et Indicibus Locupletissimis instruxit THOMAS GAIS-
FORD, A. M. Ædis Christi Alumnus, necnon Græca
Linguæ Professor Regius.* Vol. I. Oxonii, e Typo-
graphico Clarendoniano. MDCCCXIV.

WHILE we admire the learning, the accuracy, and the taste of Professor GAISSFORD, in this publication, which is certainly the *editio palmaria*, we cannot but lament that he had not, at the time when he was engaged in preparing for the press the *Poetæ Minores*, met with the *Miscellanea Philologica*, edited by A. Matthiæ, of which a Second Edition appeared in 1809, as he would have found in the excellent Dissertation of Huschke "de Fabulis Archilochi" much matter connected with Hesiod and Archilochus. Huschke has in p. 5. Vol. I. introduced an emendation of Hesiod, Opp. v. 201, which will, we think, meet with Mr. G.'s approbation, as it is founded on the authority of an Etym. Ms.:

Nῦν δὲ αἰνον βασιλεῦσ' ἔρεω φρονέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς.

Ἄδη ἵρης προσέειπεν ἀγδόνα ποικιλόδειρον.

"In hac tam facilis narratione ferendam non esse duram istam a
versu primo ad secundum orationis progressionem, nemo, semel
monitus, facile negabit. Sed hæc librariorum est, non Hesiodi

culpa: mempe legendum est ὡς Ἱρηξ (pro ὡδὶ Ἱρηξ.) *Hoc dicendi genere ubique utuntur Gr. scriptores in commemorandis fabulis Aësopis, velut Aristoph. Vesp. 1448. :*

ὅ δὲ ἔλεξεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς ὁ κάνθαρός ποτε:

ibid. v. 1181. :

ἐγάδο τοίνυν τῶν γε πάνυ κατ' οἰκίαν
ἔκεινον, ὡς οὕτω ποτ' ἦν μῆς καὶ γαλῆ:

adde v. 1177. :

πρῶτον μὲν, ὡς ἡ Ἀιμή ἀλοῦσ' ἐπέρθετο·
ἔπειτα δέ, ὡς ὁ Καρδοπῖων τὴν μητέρα.

“ Nunc fragmenta fabularum Archilochearum cum versibus Hesiodeis ex Etym. Ms. describamus. Άινος καὶ παροιμία διαφέρει· ὁ μὲν γχὸ αἰνός ἔστι λόγος κατ' ἀναπόλησιν μυθικὴν ἀπὸ ἀλόγων ζώων ἡ φυτῶν πρὸς ἀνθρώπους εἰρημένος· οἷον ἀπὸ μὲν ἀλόγων ζώων, ὁσπερ ὁ Ἀρχίλοχος· Άινος τις ἀνθρώπων, ὡς ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ ἡ (ἡδὲ) ἀετὸς ξυνωνίαν ἔθεντο. Καὶ ἀλλως· Τὸ δὲ ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλέη συνήντετο τὸ πικνὸν ἔχουσα νόον (h. e. Τῷ δὲ ἄρ' ἀλώπηξ κερδαλέῃ συνήντετο πικνὸν ε. v.) Καὶ Ἡσίοδος· Νῦν δὲ αἴνον, βασίλευσ' ἔρέω νοέουσι καὶ αὐτοῖς, ‘Ως δὲ Ἱρηξ προσέειπεν ἀηδόνα ποικιλόδειρον.

“ Ex h. l. nihil aliud lucraniur, nisi confirmationem emendationis in Hesiodeo propositae. Nam Archilochi fragmenta alibi accuratius descripta leguntur, ut ap. Ammon. in v. Άινος, quibus insigne additamentum infra adjicietur, quod sese quaerentibus nobis nunc ipsum offert.”

In the above extract from the Etym. MS. Mr. G. will notice an additional authority for the epithet *ποικιλόδειρον* as applied to ἀηδόνα, about which Ruhnen, whose note Mr. G. has cited, entertained some unnecessary scruples:

“ Atqui,” says Ruhuk., “ luscinia non est ποικιλόδειρος, sed χλωραύχην. Simonides ap. Etym. M. p. 813, 8. Eustath. Od. T. p. 1875. εὗτ' ἀηδόνες πολυκάτιλαι, χλωραύχενες, εἰαριναί. Quæ fortasse causa fuit cur Tzetzes et Moschopulus ποικιλόδειρος, sine exemplo, ποικιλόφωνος explicarent. Sed vix dubito, quin affinis sonus literarum ει et η, qui tot menda peperit, huic etiam loco corrumpendo occasionem dederit. Lege ποικιλόγηρυν. Epigr. ap. Gruter. p. 1118, 9. τὴν κυνηγίαν Μοῦσαν ἀηδόνα τὴν μελίγυρην. Theocr. Ep. iv. 11, 12. Philippus Aual. Brunck. T. ii. p. 221. Nec tamen reticere debedo, vulgatam scripturam magnis patronis uiti, Ammonio v. Άινος, Theone Progymn. p. 31. Nonno xxvi. p. 688. xlvi. p. 1204. Huc accedit, quod luscinia, auctore Clemente Alex. Pæd. II. 10. p. 221. cum voce etiam colorem mutat: ὠσαύτας δὲ καὶ ἀηδῶν καὶ τὸ χρῶμα καὶ τὴν φύὴν συμμεταβάλλει ταῖς τροπαῖς.”

We are not persuaded that a lection, so remote in its meaning from the common notion about the nightingale as *ποικιλόδειρον*, can have been substituted by illiterate transcribers for the obvious

epithet ποικιλόγνησ, and in our opinion the passage from Clem. Alex., adduced by Ruthken, is quite sufficient to vindicate ποικιλόεισον, whether the notion be in point of fact true or false. H. Steph. Thes. 111. p. 442.: “Ποικιλόδειγος, habens collum varium, i. e. versicolor, maculosum, pictum: ab Hesiodo vero in Erg. ἄνδρας ποικιλόειρος dicitur potius διὰ τὸ ποικιλόφανον seu ποικιλώδον, quod vario modulamine canat: synonymous est αἰολόδειρος.” H. Steph. has omitted the word ποικιλόγνησ. It deserves to be noticed that the Codex alter Dorvillianus has in the passage of Hesiod ποικιλόδηγον. Hesych. Δίρη τράχηλος: H. Steph. has the word in the Index to the Thes., but seems to have doubted its existence: “Δίρη Hesychio est μάχη, rugna, certamen, item τράχηλος, in hac tamen posteriore significacione dicitur potius δειρή.” Schneider has omitted δίρη i. e. τράχηλος, without reason.

On the 12th Fragment of Archilochus p. 292. Mr. Gaisford contents himself with producing the note of Jacobs:

Καὶ φρονεῖσι τοῖ, ὁκοίσι ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργματι.

“Auctor Eryxiae in Opp. Platonis p. 397. E. (T. x. p. 255. ed. Bip.): ‘Ἐχει δὲ καὶ τάλλα πράγματα οὗτα πάντα ὅποιοι γὰρ ἀν τινες ὁσιν οἱ χράμενοι, τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς ἀνάγκη είναι καλῶς δ’, ἔφη, δοκεῖ μοι καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πεποιῆσθαι.”

Καὶ φρονεῖσι τοῖα, ὁκοίσι ἐσκυρέωσιν ἔρμασι.

Ap. Stob., qui h. l. ex Eryxia profert in Flor. Tit. xci. p. 512, 51. etiam vitiosius legitur: *Καὶ φρονεῖσι τοι ἀνοίκοι οἵ ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργματος [ἐγκυρέωσιν Platonis Ms. Vat.] ubi tamen vera lectionis vestigia facile agnoscis.* Valck. ad Herod. 11. p. 141, 98. haec sic refingenda censem:

Καὶ φρονεῖσι τοῖ ὁκοίως ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργματα, i. e. καὶ τοιά εἰσι τὰ ἔργματα, ὁκοίς φρονεῖσι ἐγκυρέωσι. Rerum natura secundum hominum, in quos incident, mores mutatur. Paulo durior verborum structura; sed sensus plane is est, quem Aeschinoris contextus flagitat, et quem desiderabat Clericus in Not. ad Aeschin. p. 47.”

The passage of Aeschines occurs in Dial. II. 16. p. 71, ed. Fisch. 1786: “Ἐχει δ’, ἔφη, καὶ τάλλα πράγματα οὗτα πάντα ὅποιοι γὰρ ἀν τινες ὁσιν οἱ χράμενοι, τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ πράγματα αὐτοῖς ἀνάγκη είναι καλῶς δ’, ἔφη, δοκεῖ μοι καὶ τὸ τοῦ Ἀρχιλόχου πεποιῆσθαι, Καὶ φρονεῖσι τοῖ, ὁκοίσι ἐγκυρέωσιν ἔργμασι.” The note of FISCHER seems to have escaped the notice both of MR. JACOBS and of MR. GAISFORD.

εἴη περιειν τε σκιῇ, καὶ βίβλινος οἶνος.—Ἐργ. κ. Ἡμ. 587.

“Te om. Gal. βίβλινος I. Holstenius ad Steph. Byz. p. 67, quem secutus est Brunckius et MSS. complures. Vulgatum βίβλινος servat Eustath. II. A. p. 871, 48. Plus simplici autem incommodo labore versus. Prorsus enim inusitate et ante τοι cotripietur, et eadem fere sententia recurrit infr. 590. Quare pro-

acumine quo lector medetam, quam potest, excogitet; nam in talibus a Codd. nihil est quod exspectemus."

We leave to others, as Mr. G. has done, to settle the point about the metre. But with respect to the reading βίβλιος, we may be permitted to observe that it is a matter of no consequence whatever, whether we read βύβλιος, or βίβλιος, as there can be no doubt that both were used by the Greek writers. In our own opinion far too much attention is paid by the scholars of the present day to the orthography of certain words, which can never be accurately ascertained, because there is good reason to suppose that the Greek writers themselves did not always agree in adopting the same orthography. We are, however, disposed to admit that some of the variations in the orthography of certain words are to be ascribed to the ignorance, or the conceit of transcribers, who introduced into the works of the ancient writers the orthography of their own times. These observations are abundantly confirmed by a passage in Mazochius's Commentary "in Tabulas Heracleenses" p. 200., where the learned editor has collected every thing, which concerns the history of the βύβλιος οἶνος.

Mr. BLOMFIELD on *Aeschyl. Prom.* 836. writes thus: "Βρβλίων Med. M. 1. Colb. 2. Seld. Perpetua in h. v. inter i et u confusio. Eustath. ad Od. φ. p. 1913, 31. Ἐγταῦθα δὲ σημειώσας ἔτι ἡ Βύβλος ἐπὶ πόλεως μὲν τῆς καὶ ἐν τῷ Περιπητῆ (v. 912.) μένος διὰ τοῦ ὑ γεάρεται· ἐπὶ δὲ φυτοῦ, ὡς ἐπὶ πολὺ μὲν, καὶ μελιστα παρετοῖς ἀρχαιοῖς, ὄμοια ἡ γεάρη· οἱ δὲ νεώτεροι τρέψαντες, κατὰ τὸ δύφρενον δίφρες, μῆτος μίσος, βίβλος διὰ τοῦ ιώτα φασι. Brunck. up. Aristoph. βιβλίον ubique reposuit. In Eurip. Ion. 1195. pro βιβλίου τε πόρατος, legendum βυβλίου. Βύβλιον οἶνος memorant Theocr. Athen. Eustath. et alii. Cf. Xenoph. Anab. VII. 5, 8. Pausan. Achaic. p. 406. cum Antonin. Lib. c. 30. Parthenium in Erotic. XI. Heinsium ad Ovid. Met. ix. 452. Pierson. ad Moerin p. 95. Βιβλία, διὰ τοῦ i, ὡς Πλάτων, Ἀττικῶς. Βυβλία, ὡς Δημοσθένης, καινῶς."

Mr. B. is, we think, mistaken in supposing that the passage in Euripides needs any correction. From what he adds, after correcting the passage of Euripides, it is plain that he thought that the ancient writers speak only of βύβλιος οἶνος, whereas it has been shown by Mazochius that the word was anciently written βύβλιος, βίβλιος, βίμβλιος. H. Steph. has in the Index to the Thes. acknowledged both βύβλιος, and βίβλιος, and βίμβλιος, but SCHNEIDER has in his Lexicon neglected to insert βίμβλιος.

"Ἡ δὲ Φίξ' ὀλοὴν τέκε, Καδμείσιτος ὀλεθρον.—Theogon. 326.

Mr. G. produces Graevius's excellent note, which is this:—
"Reposui veterem lectionem ex antiquorum scholiis auctore,
qui legit Φίξ' ὀλοὴν, et explicat σφήγαν ὀλοήν. Ab aliis vero Belotus
dixisse Φίξα, unde φίξιον λέγει, ubi Spinozus astatat regit. Huic

Euripidis Scholiastes ad *tipulatit in Phainis*, qui tradit φίλον ὄρος a Sphinge dictum esse; ipsamque a Boeotis vocatam φίκα. Hinc et Lat. *picti* dicti, quorum pedes formam Spingam habebant. Festus: ‘*Picti* appellantur quidam, quorum pedes formati sunt in speciem Spingum, quod eas Dorii *phicas* vocant.’ Sic φίκειον τέρας dicitur Sphinx ap. Lycophronem v. 1463. Φίκιον vero est mons Boeotiae, cuius meminit in ‘*Aσπίδι*’ v. 33. Stephanus de Urbibus: Φίκειον ὄρος Βοιωτίας καὶ διὰ διφθύγου καὶ διὰ βραχίων τοῦ λ. Vide et Plutarchum in libello, *Quod Brutus ratione utatur.* Mr. Gaisford adds, “Φίξ” Trinc. σφίγγ’ Ald.,” but does not appear to have noticed the passages of Hesychius: Βίκας σφίγγας, (where Kuster says, “Boeoti, ni fallor, pro σφίγγας dicebant βίκες, vel φίκες,” and where Alberti refers to Ez. Spanh. de P. et U. N. p. 219.): Φίγα φίκα, σφίγγα, where Kuster says, “Φίκα pro σφίγγα dixerunt Boeoti, vide Grævii Lectt. Hesiod. c. 24. p. 121.” Φίκιον προσθηβᾶν, where Palmerius reads, Φίκιον ὄρος πρὸς Θηβᾶν, and Hemsterh. has the following note:—“Æoles Φίγα, vel Φίκα efferrunt pro σφίγγα, unde Boeoti adspirata in tenuem conversa βίκας formant, quæ Hesych. suppeditat. Hinc Boeotia monti nomen accessit Φίκιον, vel Φίκειον, quem Palmerius Hesychio restitutum voluit in istis, Φίκιον προσθηβᾶν, valde probabili conjectura: poterat tamen etiam refungi, Φίκτων προσθηβᾶν, vel προσήθων: nam supra legitur, Σφίκται οἱ χίνιδοι καὶ αἴταλοι: tates autem plerunque πρώτηθοι, primo atatis flore grati: omissum est σ, quod hic a dialecto pendeat, an erranti Hesychio sit tribuendum, non tenere dixerō.”

Festus, as we have seen, makes the word *phicas* peculiar to the Dorians, whereas the scholiast of Euripides, quoted by Grævius, “tradit φίκιον ὄρος a Sphinge dictum esse, ipsamque a Boeotis vocatam φίκα.” Hemsterhuis differs from both: “Æoles φίγα, vel φίκα efferrunt pro σφίγγα, unde Boeoti adspirata in tenuem conversa βίκας formant, quæ Hesych. suppeditat.” Kuster, on the first passage from Hesych., says, “Boeoti, ni fallor, pro σφίγγας dicebant βίκες, vel φίκες,” but on the second he writes, “Φίκα pro σφίγγα dixerunt Boeoti, vide Grævii Lectt. Hesiod. c. 24. p. 121.” Hemsterhuis has produced no authority for his assertion that φίγα vel φίκα is the Æolic word, whence the Boeotian βίκα descends. There can be little doubt that φίκα is the true Boeotian word, because it occurs in the Boeotian poet Hesiod, because it is ascribed to the Boeotians by the Schol. of Euripides, and because φίκειον, or φίκειον was the name of a mountain in Boeotia. We are not aware that any ancient authority can be adduced for ascertaining the dialects, in which βίκα and φίγα were used for φίκα. Turnebus thus writes in the *Adversaria III. 10.* “*Picæ* ap. Festum: Lat. in tit. p. sunt sphinges, unde et ap. cum *picti*, quamquam obsecrari ex se pictos propagare possunt, qui Latinis

sunt avide illæ volucres ferre gryphæ vocatae, aurum e cavernis penitus egentes: pilare et compilare dubium non est, quin a verbo Gr. deducantur Æolico πίλητες, i. e. fur, qui pilosus ab Hesiodo vocatur, sed Æolium est aspirationes in tenuis mutare, ut et in superiore vocabulo, pro σφιγξ, Dorice φίξ, et Æolice φίξ, unde Lat. pica et picatus."

H. Stephens has inserted in his *Thesaurus* both φίξ and φίξ, SCHNEIDER has the second, but omits the first; neither of these lexicographers has noticed φίξα for βίκα. H. Steph. says well, "ut φίξ dicitur pro σφιγξ, ita et φίν pro σφιν, ut tum ap. Homericum, tum ap. Callimachum;" for there can be no doubt that φίξ is radically the same word as σφιγξ. Bochart (*Canaan* 1. 16.) derives the word *phlica* from a Phœnician word, *picchea*, or *phiccaa*, signifying "sapient, oculatus, auritus," "propter sagacitatem, quia mulier fuit acutissima, quæ per gryphos et ænigmata solertissimorum sui ævi ingenia exercebat." *Grammaticus Ms.* in *Biblioth. Leidensi* ap. Valck. ad *Aimmon.* p. 103.: Τὰ τοις ἐξ μυνοσύλλαβαι ὄνόματα, διὸ ἔχη τὸ φ., διὰ τοῦ καλίνεται, οἷον φρίξες φρίξος, φίξες φίξος: εἰ δὲ μὴ ἔχει τὸ φ., διὰ τοῦ χ., οἷον στρίξ στρίχος, θρίξ τριχος: πλὴν τοῦ ἑξ ικός, ὅπτι δὲ ὁ ἑσθίων τὰς ἀμπέλους σκάλης.

On the 993d verse of *Theognis* Mr. G. is silent about the correction of J. D. a Lennep: "'Αγαθὰ speciatim ad cibos transfertur cum sacer alibi, tuni in illo *Theogn.* 993. Δείπνου δῆ λήγοιμεν, ἔπον τινὰ θυμὸς ἀνάγει, Παντούν ἀγαθῶν γαστρὶ χαριζόμενοι, quorum facilis correctio est, cum, quod ap. Atheneum L. v. 11. p. 310. A. hujus loco legitur Δ. δ. λήγοι μένος ὃν τινὰ θ. ἀνάγει Π. literis aliter in verba distinctis aptam efficiat sententiam, Δ. δ. λήγοιμεν, ὃπον τινὰ θ. ἀνάγει Παντούν, κ.τ.λ." Jo. D. a Lennep ad *Phalaridis Epist.* p. 338.

On the 73d verse of *Theognis*, JACOBS writes thus: "Quod Brunckius, ap. *Theogn.* v. 73. Πρῆξιν μηδὲ φίλοισιν ὀλος ἀνακοίνεον τῷτιν, scripsit ὅμως, id minime necessarium." Jacobsii Append. in *Lucian.* ap. Porsoni *Advers.* p. 294.

NOTULÆ QUÆDAM IN PLATONIS MENEXENUM.

Edito, quâ usus sum, studiis Societatis Bipontine debetur: ejus paginas, ejus lineas in his adnotationibus, semper adhibui.

[p. 274. l. 1.] Ἐγώ γοῦν δὲ πόθεν Μενέξενος; Sed noster in principio sui *Phædri*, sicut in *Protagoræ* initio rogat φίλε Φαῖδρε, ποι-

δὴ καὶ πόθεν; quam interrogandi formulam imitatur Horat. Sat. iv. 1.
“ Unde et quo Catus?”

[l. 2.] Ἐξ ἀγορᾶς καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ βουλευτηρίου. Simili modo haec verba conjungit Tacit. Agric. ii. “Monumenta clarissimorum ingeniorum in comitio ac foro urerentur.” Ex quibus locis patet tam Athenis quam Romæ comitium in foro extitisse.

[l. 8.] συμβόλεντή ἄρχειν. Malè, ut mihi quidem videtur, servant editiones: levissimā mutatione hunc locum sanabis: tu mecum συμβούλεντης reponas, quod postulat rei ratio Græcitatisq[ue] analogia.

[l. 11.] ταφὰς μέλλουσι ποιεῖν. Sed in Thucyd. B. λδ. “οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, τῷ πατρίῳ νόμῳ χρώμενοι, δημοσίᾳ ταφὰς ἐποιήσαντο κ. τ. λ.” quæ expressio melior est. Nam plerumque cum voculis τῷ ταφῇ similibus ritusque et cæremonias indicantibus ποιέομαι conjungunt Græci: cum verbis locum et rem denotantibus ποιέω adhibetur, ut in sectione anteā citata “σκηνὴν ποιήσαντες,” “ἐκείνων δὲ διαπρεπῆ τὴν ἀρετὴν εργαντες, αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸν τάφον ἐποίησαν.”

[l. 12.] ἀλλὰ τίνα εἶδοντο. sc. οἱ βουλευταί. Quibusdam ex mortuorum consanguineis decerpatis funeris publico sumtu celebrati curationem permisit populus. Ili circumstanti spectatorum coronæ sedes et loca, tanquam dispensatores, distribuebant, ritusque cæremoniasque et epulas pro voluptate suâ instituebant. Qui defunctorum virtutes comparatâ oratione verborumque elegantissi laudaret, a senatu, si Platoni credas, eligebatur: cui tamen repugnare videtur Thucyd. B. λδ ad finem “ἐπειδαν δὲ κρύψωσι γῆ, ὥστε ἡρημένος ὑπὸ τῆς πόλεος, ὃς ἂν γνώῃ τε δοκῆ μη ἀζύνετο εἴραι, καὶ ἀζώματο προήκη, λέγει ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἔπαινον τὸν πρέποτα:” quam sententia discrepancyem, si cuiquam discrepatio esse videatur, Demosthenis ope, facilissime corrigas: audi ipsum oratorum principem, “τὸν πολὺν ρέοντα,” sic in sua de corona oratione § πη loquentem: “Χειροτονῶν γάρ ὁ δῆμος τὸν ἐροῦντ’ ἐπὶ τοῖς τετελευτησίοις, παρ’ αὐτὰ τὰ συμβάντα, οὐ σὲ ἔχειροντος προβληθέντα [sc. ὅποι τῆς βουλῆς] οὐ σὲ καίπερ εὑφωνον ὄντα:” iterumque in sequenti cap. “Καὶ οὐχ ὁ μὲν δῆμος νῦτως, οἱ δὲ τῶν τετελευτησότων πατέρες καὶ ἀδελφοὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου τότε πάρεβάντες ἐπὶ τὰς ταφὰς, ἀλλως πως ἀλλα, δέους ποιεῖν αὐτοὺς τὸ περίδειπνον, τοῦτον ἐποίησαν παρ’ ἐμοὶ.” Unde senatum elegisse, populumque oratores approbasse clarissimè liquet.

[p. 275. l. 1.] πολλαχοῦ κινδυνεύει καλὸν εἶναι τὸ ἐν πολέμῳ ἀποθήσκειν. Roete ad spiritum sed non ad hujuscet loci constructionem interpretati sunt editores “Videtur apud plurimas gentes præclarum esse in bello occumbere.” Græco sermoni propiora habebis, si sic construas “apud plurimas gentes parum abest, quin ad honorem famamque ducat mors in bello oppedita.” De verbo κινδυνεύει Basili Scholia ἀνέδοτα in Greg. Nazian. Orat. xxxii. conferas “τὸ δὲ κινδυνεύει ἐλέγκεσθαι καὶ δεικνυθεῖν νῦν σημαίνει: Δημοσθένης κατὰ Μεδον· ἀλλὰ κινδυνεύει τὸ λίαν εὐτυχὲς ἐπαχθεῖς ποιεῖν—Καὶ ἐπὶ ἀγωνοῦ δὲ εἰληπται, ὡς Ἐφρογένης ἐν τῷ τέχνῃ οὐ κατὰ δύναμιν τὴν ἐν δεινότητι ἐκεῖ γάρ, φησι, κινδυνεύει τὰ πρώτα φέρεσθαι ἀντὶ τοῦ προτεριμματι, προκεκριται. Quæ ex Grammatico MS. de Syntaxi in Bibl. Sangorm. discripta fuisse monet Ruhnkenius. Tzetzes Scholiis MSS. in Hermogenem, sic loquitur τὸ κινδυνεύει λέξιν μὲν Πλατωνικ

ὑπάρχει· τὸ δὲ ἀραικαῖς ἔχειν σημαίνει ταῦτη, νοεῖ. Recte Platoniam locutionem vocat, quæ tam crebra apud Platōnēm est, ut singulis paginis reperiatur: sed nec ipse, nec alii Grammatici locutionis rationem bene explicuerunt. Optime, ut Ruhnkenio videtur hoc verbum per ἑγγίζει exponit Timæus. Nam, ut Latini dicunt, *periculum est ne hoc ita sit, pro parum abest quin ita sit*, sic etiam Græci κυρεύειν pro ἑγγίζειν.

[l. 4.] καὶ ἐὰν φᾶλος ἦ. Interpretes “sive etiam vilis quisplana et ignavus.” Malè meā quidem sententiā: non enim ad hominis vitam in facinore consumptam sed ad humilem in civitate conditionem spectat oratio. Sic vocabulo *vile* utitur Shakespearius nostras in Henrico V. Act. iv. Scen. 3. ubi rex comites suos adloquens, dicit, “For he to-day who sheds his blood with me Shall be my brother: be he ne'er so *vile*, This day shall gentle his condition.” Haud tamen ignoro quod huic meae significationi repugnare videtur Thucyd. B. μβ. καὶ γὰρ τοῖς τάλλα χειροσι δίκαιον τὴν ἐς τοὺς πολέμους ὑπὲρ ταρπίδος ἀνδραγαθίαν προτίθεσθαι.

[l. 16.] οὐα δὴ τὰ πολλὰ ἀεὶ μετ' ἐμοῦ. Cf. Blomfield Prom. Vinct. 973. Σεβοῦ, προσευχοῦ, θῶπτε τὸν κρατοῦντ' ἀεὶ. “Hanc sententiam optimè reddidit Butlerus, “unumquemque regnantem.” Anglice, “whoever happens to be in power.” “Hæc vis τοῦ Ἀεὶ cum apud Scriptores Atticos præsertim Oratores frequentissima sit, sæpius tamen minus perspecta, interpretes in errorem duxit.” Thuc. A. ia. οὐκ ἄθροος, ἀλλὰ μέρει τῷ ἀεὶ παρατυχόντι, ἀντεῖχον. Cf. quoque Thuc. B. ia. ἀπὸ θεραπείας τῶν ἀεὶ προεστώτων.

[p. 276. l. 5.] οὐθως ἔναυλος ὁ λόγος τε κ. τ. λ. Ruhnkenius in suis super Timæo adnotationibus hæc sequentia ex Lexic. Rhetor. MS. laudat ἔναυλον—ἔνηχον αὐλὸς γὰρ τὰν τὸ στενὸν, καὶ ἐπίμηκες ὁ δὲ τόπος τῶν ὕπων τοιούτος. Miltonus in exquisito suo de Paradiso amissâ poemate nobis hominem vivis coloribus depinxit qui τὸν λόγον ἔναυλον ἐν τοῖς ὕσιν habet: qui locus, ut meam de hujuscce verbi significatione sententiam optimè exponit, hic laudabitur. Lib. viii. ad init. “The angel ended—and in Adam's ear So charming left his voice that he awhile Thought him still speaking, still stood fixed to hear.” Cf. Crito ε2. “ταῦτα εὖ ἴσθι ὅτι ἔγω δοκῶ ἀκούειν, ὥσπερ οἱ κορυφαῖσι τῶν αὐλῶν δοκοῦσιν ἀκούειν” καὶ ἐν ἔμοὶ αὕτῃ ἡ ἡχὴ τούτων τῶν λόγων βορᾷει καὶ ποιεῖ μὴ δύνασθαι τῶν ἀλλων ἀκούειν” Rursus Plato de Leg. iii. p. 585. ‘Ἐκ γὰρ τῶν ὑψηλῶν εἰς τὰ κεδεῖα καταβαίνειν, οἷμαι, πᾶσιν φίβος ἔναυλος ἔγεγονει. Ἐσχin. de Coronâ, §. Ἑγ. ἔναυλον γὰρ ἦτι τότε πᾶσιν, ὅτι τρυκαῖτα ὁ δῆμος κατελίθη, ubi Palmerius observat metaphoram ab iis sumtam esse quibus post tibiarium sonum aures adhuc personant Maxim. Tyr. Diss. vii. p. 71. καὶ τὰ ὄτα ἔναυλος ὃν δαμέμηνηται τοῦ μέλοντος καὶ μινηρίζει πρὸς αὐτόν. Ad hujus translate locutionis exemplum, audacter quidem, sed venustè contrarium dixit Synesius de republica p. 32. et de insom. p. 153. εἰ μὴ θυρανδήσουσιν οἱ λόγοι περὶ τὰ ὄτα—Hunc nostri locum expressit disertissimus Sophista, qui se totum ad Platonis imitationem comparaverat, Themistius Orat. vi. p. 81. καὶ ταῦτα ἔναυλον εἰς τὰ ὄτα ἐνδεδυκότα περιφέρων ἔτι τὸν λόγον.

[l. 8.] Έν μακάρων νήσοις. Cf. Callistrati Scholiop. Φλαγθ' Αρμόδι', οὐ τι πιο τέθητες. Νήσους δὲ καὶ μακάρων σε φασίν εἶναι, Ἰναπερ ποδόκηρος Ἀχιλλεῖς Τυδεΐδης τα φασίν Διομῆδεα. Pindar. Olymp. II. 128. 136. μακάρων Νάσον ὀκεανίδες Αἴραι περιπνέονται. ἄλλο—θεμα δὲ χρυσῆς φλέγεται. Τὰ μὲν χερούσθεν ἀπ' ἄλλο—γλαῶν δευδρέων, Υδωρ δ' ἄλλα φέρεται. "Ορμοῖσι τῶν χέρας ἀνά—πλέκονται καὶ στεφάνους.

[l. 11.] Εἴς ὑπογύλιον γὰρ παντάπασιν ἡ αἵρεσις γέγονεν. Pro hoc νεκροῖς παντάπασιν Tragici utuntur πᾶσιν. Cf. Col. 1446. Ἀνάξιαι γὰρ τὰσιν ἔστε δυστυχεῖν, et Cf. Rex. 40. ἢ κράτιστον πᾶσιν Οἰδίπεις κάρα.

[p. 277. l. 3.] Οὐκ οἶει, ὁ Σώκρατης. i. e. οἶει ὡς εἶναι μέτρα. Similis τοῦ οὐκ usus in Xenophontis Anabasi A. iii. ad init. invenitur. οἱ γὰρ στρατιώται οὐκ ἔφασαν ιέναι τοῦ πρώτου i. e. ἔφασαν οὐκ ιέναι εἰς τὸ μέρος τοῦ χωρίου ὅπτις πρώτων, quod minus perspexerunt editores; "tu mecum construas ulterius se porrecturos negabant." Similiter οὐκ ἔψη non idem quod Latine "non verbum addidit," sed "se hoc vel illud facturum esse negabat" sonat: sed de his nequid nimis.

[l. 4.] Οὐ μέντοι, μὰ Δία. μὰ Δία negantis, νὴ Δία plerumque affirmantis est. cf. Aristoph. Plut. 100. ubi Pluto dicenti "Αρετόν με νῦν ζετον γὰρ ἴδη τάπ' ἐμοῦ respondet ille senex Chremylus μὰ Δῖ, ἀλλὰ τολλῷ μᾶλλον ἐξόμεσθα σοῦ, i. e. οὐκ ἀφησόμεσθα, et in eadem fabella v. 128. Χρει—Εγὼ γὰρ ἀποδεῖξω σε τοῦ Διὸς πολὺ Μεῖζον διδάμενον ΠΛ....ἐμὲ σύ....ΧΡ. νὴ τὸν οὐρανόν, i. e. "Me hoc esse facturum per eosolum juro." Sed huic Grammaticorum regulæ adversatur hujusdem comedie v. 74. quem videas.

[l. 8.] Αλλ' ὥπερ τολλούς—περιπλέα τὸν Σάνθιππον. Hæc ad eam Aspasiam spectant, quæ veteri illustrique Miletii civitate orta patrem habuit Axiochum tamque eximiae fuit pulcritudinis ut de eâ dicere solerent amatores, "Induitur, formosa est; exuitur, ipsa forma est"—Hæc tamen oris suavitatis ingenii magnitudine adeo superabatur ut minus corporis quam mentis dotibus amantium animos sibi devincire videretur: Socratem enim, virum multiplicem virtutibus, gnavum, agilem, providumque, et rigidè sectatorem virtutis inter amicos sodalesque numeravit: et Periclem hominum ætatis suæ facile principem, et civiliū militariūque officiorum patientem ac peritum pariter, tanto amore adurebat, ut, quicquid ei liberet, id ille pro licito vindicaret, et pro virili faceret. Hinc bellum inter Samios Atheniensesque suos conflavisse narrabatur, vehementi Aspasiae anuore percussus ejusque illecebris delinitus: quam suspicionem augebat constans rumor eundem, ubi otio locum fecissent negotia, sœminia familiaritate assidue abusum: hinc deriyabatur acerrima comicorum poetarum deriso, "inq̄ rugas mille redibant" Aspasia Periclesque nomine: unum ē multis, quæ nostri loco attinent, exemplis lectori sufficiat. Aristoph. Ach. 524, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν δὴ σμικρὰ κάτιχώρια πέρυρη δὲ Σιμαίδαν λόρτες Μεγάρας Νεανίας κλέπτοντοι μεθυσοκόπταβοι· καθ' οἱ Μεγάρης οδύναι τοιγιγνέντοι· Αἰταέκλεψαν Ασπασίας πόργα δύο· κάντειν δρυχὸν κατεβάτην· "Ελλαῖς τὰσιν ἐκ τριῶν λακαστρίων. Τιτεῖθεν πρυτανεῖς οὐλόμπιος Νοτραπή, ἐφράντα, ἔννεκτα τὴν Εὔλαδα, Qui plura velit, is Pericles vitam, a Plutarcho conscriptam, audeat."

[L. 11.] ὁ μὲν μονοῦς. In hoc loco verbum verbo reddere curaverunt nostri vèrè fidi interpres "Coxus quidem musicæ male quidem, si per musicam "modulorum concinnorum scientiam," et non "intentionem, remissionem, flexum et modulationem vocis intelligas: omnia quæ in orando maxime pertinent ad invenient audientium affectus. Huic vocis modulandæ studio si discere velimur quam pertinaciter se impenderent antiquiores, uno contenti *opus* exemplo Caii Gracchi, præcipui suorum temporum oratoris, cui concionanti consistens post eum musicus fistula, quam *τροχίου vocem*, modos, quibus deberet intendi, ministrabat: de qua re adeat, qui vellet. Ciceron. de Orat. iii. 60, 61. Gellium i. 11. Valer. Maxim. viii. 10. Quintilian de Inst. Orat. i. 10. Plutarchum in Graccho H. Steph. p. 1513.

Quoniam verò de verbo *μονοῦς* agitur locusque adest opportunitus, occasionem paullo fusiū de hac vocula disserendi libenter arripiam. Budæus post prolixas ex Platone et Aristotele de *μονοῖς* et *μονοῦσι* citationes, summam antedictorum colligens affirmat, "musicæ appellationem apud *priscos* humanitatem literarum significasse, in qua ingenuos homines docebant otium conterere animunque recreare: *recentiores* verò ad numerorum modulationem hoc vocabulum translatisse, quia musica, velut ludus, animi a cura vexati est requies." Huic docto viro doctiorem Quintiliani sententiam opponamus, qui in libro primo de Institutione suâ Oratoriâ cap. 10. sic loquitor. "Nam quis ignorat musicen tantum jam illis ANTIQUIS temporib non studii modo, verum etiam venerationis habuisse, ut iidem Mu et vates et sapientes judicarentur?" Scilicet illud Roinanæ togæ decus et ornamentum Pindaricam τὸς σοφὸς significationem in mentem suum vocabat, quippe Pindarus poetas semper τὸς σοφὸς denominat, quod liqueat, ut unum e multis locum extérpam, ex Olymp. 1. 13. "Ἄθεος ὁ πολύφαρος Υμνος ἀμφιβάλλεται Σοφῶν μηρίσσωι κ. τ. λ." Sic etiam Aristophanes Vespa 1243. "μετὰ τοῦτον Αἰσχύνης ὁ Σέλλων δέξεται Ἀνὴρ σοφὸς καὶ μονοῦς, κἄτ' φερεται κ. τ. λ." Et Timagenes auctor est omnium in literis studiorum antiquissimam Musicen extitisse, et testimonio sunt clarissimi poete, apud quos inter regalia convivia laudes heroum ac Deorum ad citharam canebantur. Atque clarus nomine sapientiae viros nemo dubitaverit studiosos Musices fuisse, quum Pythagoras atque eum secuti, acceptam sine dubio antiquitas opinionem, vulgaverint, mundum ipsum ejus ratione esse compositum. Plato in Timæo ne intelligi quidem nisi ab iis, qui hanc quoque partem disciplinæ diligenter perceperint, potest. Archytas atque Aristoxenus etiam subjectam grammaticen musicæ putaverunt, tum Eupolis, apud quem Prodamus et *musicen* et *literas* docet. Et Muricas, qui est Hyperbolus, nihil se ex *musicis* scire nisi literas confitetur. Aristophanes quoque non uno libro sic institui pueros antiquitus solitos esse demonstrat: et apud Menandrum in Hypoboliense senex rēposcenti filium patri rationem impediortum quæ in educationem contulerat, opponens psaltis se et geometris, multa dicit dedisse: unde etiam ille mos, ut in conviviis post cœnam circumstetetur lyra; cuius quum se imperitum Themistocles confessus esset, ut verbis Ciceronis

utar, habitus est indoctior. Ex quibus locis immane quantum discrepant Quiactiliani Budæique sententiae facilimè appareat. *Hic enim, ταῦτα τῷ μουσικῇ harmonice numeros modosque significante, alijs liberalium artium significationem deducit: ille autem "doctrinam" primarium esse sensum, unde postea derivabatur secundus.* Horum utri credamus, Quirites? His sequentibus bene persensis, judicet equissimus lector. Athenæus in libro suo xv. hæc habet, τὸ δὲ ἀρχαιον ἡ μουσικὴ ἐπ' ἄνδρεον προροπή ἦν. Xenophon in Rep. Lacedæmonica de pueris et adolescentibus Spartanis εὐθὺς δὲ πέμποντις εἰς διδασκάλων, μαθησομένους καὶ γράμμata, καὶ μουσικὴν, καὶ τὰ ἐν Παλαιστρᾷ, sicut Arist. Polit. vii. dicit quatuor præcipue esse quæ discere solet juniores γράμμata καὶ γυμναστικὴν καὶ μουσικὴν καὶ ἔντονην γραφικὴν—omnia quæ exempla ab Henrico Stephano ut Budæi sententiam corroborarent adducta per "scientiam doctrinamque" explicat. *Ne Lexicographorum summus: sed, ni fallor, in contrarium rei quam probare conatur, tendunt. Duximus enim maximos et fidibus et tibiis mississe traditum, quod ex Theocriti Ἡραλδῳ v. 103. accipimus Γράμμata μὲν τὸν παῖδα [sc. Ἡραλδὴ] γέρων Λίνος ἐξεδίδαξεν. Τόξον δὲ ἑκτανύσας καὶ ἐπίσκοπον εἶναι σῖστων Εὔρυτος, ἐκ πατέρων μεγάλεις ἀφειός ἀρούραις. Αὐτὰρ ποιὸν ἔθηκε καὶ ἅμφω χείρας ἐπλασσε Πυξένη τὴν φόρμιγγι Φιλαμμονίδας Εύμωλπος—atque ex Cornelio Nepote, "Ereditus sic erat Epaminondas ut nemo Thebanus magis: nam et citharizare et cantare ad chordarum sonum doctus est a Dionysio, qui non minore fuit in musicis gloriâ quam Damon aut Lamprus, quorum pervulgata sunt nonnula cantare carmina tibiis ab Olympiodoro, saltare a Calliphrone: at philosophie præceptorem habuit Lysim Tarentinum Pythagoræum."* Adde quod Lycurgus durissimarum Lacedæmoniis legum auctor, musices disciplinam probavit, exercitusque Spartanos musicis accensit modis ὥστε μουσικὴν ἐπ' ἄνδρεον εἶναι προροπήν. Præterea meam locorum antedictorum constructionem defendit Arist. Plut. 1160. Πλούτῳ γάρ ἐστι τοῦτο συμφερώτατον Ποιεῖν ἄγνωστα μουσικὸν καὶ γυμνικόν. Ranae 727. Τῶν πολιτῶν δὲ οὐδὲ μὲν λαμπεῖν εὐγενεῖς καὶ σώφροντος "Ανδρας ὄντας καὶ δικαίους καὶ καλούς τε κλευθούς Καὶ τραφέντας ἐν παλαιστρais καὶ χοροῖς καὶ μουσικῇ Προυσελοῦμεν—ubi ex Blomfieldi monitu veterem lectiounem rejicimus. ibid. 797. καὶ γὰρ ταλάντῳ μουσικὴ σταθμίσεται. Pind. Olymp. i. 22. Ἀγλατζεραι δὲ καὶ Μουσικᾶς ἐν ἀντρῷ. Pauca sunt, si ulla, quæ Budæi sententiam patrocinantur, loca ex antiquioribus scriptoribus desumpta: ubi μουσικὴ pro omni institutione liberali, quam ἐγκύρωται παιδεῖαι vocant, sumitur, auctor post Thucydidis tempora vixit. Hæc Budæi citationibus adjicias. Plato civili viro quem πολιτικὸν vocant, necessariam musicen creditit. In Equitibus v. 188. hic oritur sermo inter Agarocritum et Demum. 'Αγ. Αλλ' Ἰ γάθ, οὐδὲ μουσικὴν ἐκίσταμαι Πλὴν γραμμάτων, καὶ ταῦτα μέντοι κακὰ κακῶς. ΔΗ. Τοῦτο σε μάνοι ἐβλαψέν, ὅτι καὶ κακὰ κακῶς Ἡ δημαγγωγία γὰρ οὐ πρὸς μουσικούς "Ἐσ' ἐστὲ ἄνδρος, οὐδὲ χρηστοῦ τοῦς τρόπους. Ranae 171. Ιδει τον λιβανωτὸν δεῖρό τος καὶ τῷρ δόγα, "Οπτε ἀν εἴσωμαι πρὸ τῶν ασφυσμάτων ἀργῆται· ἀρίσται τύνει μουσικώτατα. In Platonis lib. ii. de Leg. "Ἐστι δέ τον παιδεῖα, η μὲν ἐπὶ σώματι, γυμναστικὴ, ἐπὶ δὲ Ψυχῆ, μουσικὴ; ubi mox sequitur

μουσικὴ δὲ εἶται, τίθης λόγους οὐδὲ : "Εγώ γε inquit alter. Iosephates μανούσιον πόλιν dicit urbem litterarum amantissimam in Epistola ad præfectos Mytilenæos Αἰσχύρὸν γὰρ τὴν μὲν πόλιν ὕψος ὅπερ περιπομπαὶ μουσικῶστάγου εἴναι, τὸν δὲ προύχοντα τῶν τοῦ φωνῆς πολὺ τὴν ιστορίαν τῆς παιδείας ταυτῆς φεύγειν ἐκ τῆς τοιαύτης πολέως. Notum est illud in Eunthro, " periculum fac in musicis :" pīmītū ab ipso Cicerone Tusc. v. 23. Musæ pro doctrinâ et humanitate ponuntur.

[p. 278. 7.] Περιλεγματά ἄπτα ἐξ ἑκένου συγκολλώσιον. *Onnes*
Athenarum laudes quas in funebri suā oratione omisit Pericles, *anc*
Platonis oratio complectitur. Multa de populo, multa et ea de reipub-
licē πολετείᾳ praeclara dixerunt priores, nihil de historiā rebusque
Atticis disserentes. Hoc igitur campo quoniam magis in aperto
cunctisque adhuc fuissest intactus, primus omnium decurrere Lyrias
decrevit, tam verbis quam sententiis gravis orator: quem Plato, *qua*
immensum ingenii aperiebat opus, passibus mihiimē imperibas
sectatus, hanc e filis a Pericle relictis deductam orationem, *tau*
Aspasiano sermoni supplementum, compositū.

[l. 11.] 'Αλλ' ὅπως μὴ μοι χαλεπανεῖ ή διδάσκαλος—subaudiens δέδοικα aut quid simile. cf. Aeschyl. Prom. 68. ὅπως μὴ σφρόνων οἰκτιεῖς ποτε, ubi ὄφατέον aut βλέπετόν supplendum est. Plene dixit Thucyd. B. 57. ὄφατε, ὅπως μὴ οὐκ ἀποδέξωνται ubi ex Dawesiano canone ἀποδέξονται reponas. Accipe etiam quae vir huius speculi, dum vixit, doctissimus de his verbis ad Hecubam V. 398. habet. "Plerumque quidem ὅπως vel ὅπως μὴ cum secundâ personâ, aliquando cum tertiâ construitur. Aristoph. Eccles. 296. "Οπως δὲ τὸ σύμβολον Λαθόντες ἐπειτα πλη—σίοι καθεδούμεθα. Plene dixit post paulo "Ορε δ' ὅπως ὠθήσουμαι τούδε τοὺς ἔξι ἄστεος."

[l. 18.] Εἰ με κελεύεις ἀποδύντο ὄρχησάσθαι, χαρισαίμην ἀν. Ήττε
habes loquentem Ciceronem in oratione, quam habuit pro Murens.
Saltatorem appellat L. Murænam Cato. "Si vere objicitur saltatio,
maledictum est velmentis accusatoris; sin falso, maledici convicia-
toris. Quarè cum istà sis auctoritate, Marce Cato, non debes temere
consulem populi Romani saltatorem vocare, sed conspicere quibus
præterea vitiis affectum esse necesse sit eum, cui vere istud objici-
possit. Nemo enim ferè saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit, neque in
solitudine, neque in convivio moderato atque honesto." Apud Romanos
ita inhonesta saltatio putabatur, ut Domitianus quæstorum virum,
quod gesticulandi saltandique studio teneretur, movit Senatu. Semper
niam reprehendit Sallustius nou quod saltare, sed quod optimè saltare
sciret. "Erat," inquit, "docta psallere et saltare elegantius quam
necessse est probæ." Luculentam sanè de saltatione historiam narrat
Herodotus in Erato Sect. 139. qua Hippoclydes Agaristam Clithenæ
filiam et hæredem unicam per gesticulationes suas amisit. Κλεισθένης
γὰρ τὰ μὲν τρώτα καὶ τὰ δεύτερα ὄρχεομένου ἀποστρέψαν γαμήλιὸν δὲ οἱ
τε γενέσθαι Ἰπποκλεῖδεα διὰ τὴν τε ὄρχησιν καὶ τὴν ἀναιδεψην, κατέσχεν
ἐντός, οὐ βουλόμενος ἐκραγῆκαι ἐς αὐτὸν ὡς δὲ εἰδε τοῖσι σκλητοῖς
χειροκοπίσασθαι, οὐκέτι κατέχειν δυνάμενος, εἶπε, "Οἱ παῖς Τιστάκρου
ἀπωρήσασι γε μὴν τὸν γάμον" ὁ δὲ Ἰπποκλεῖδης ὑπολαβὼν εἶπε
"Οἱ φραστὲς, Ἰπποκλεῖδον." Sed ne tam turpem apud Grecos quam

apud Romanos saltationem putaveris, actas "in Epaminondæ virtutibus
commemorari saltasse eum commode, scienter tibi cantasse," rem
quæcum voluntate quædam incredibili narrat Nepos.

[p. 279. 1.] Ἔργῳ μὲν ἡμῖν οἴδε κ.τ.λ. cf. nobilissimam de hoc loco
Longini sententiam in inuictoriā περὶ Τύφους. ὅ. καὶ tractatu. Ἡ περί-
φρασις τοῦ λάκιος συμφέγγεται τῷ κυριολογίᾳ καὶ εἰς κάρμον ἐπιτολὺν
σταθῆται μάλιστ' ἀν μὴ ἔχῃ φυσῶδες τι καὶ ὑμουσον, ἀλλ' ἡδῶν κεκρα-
μένων. Ἰκανὸς δὲ τοῦτο τεκμηρώσαι καὶ Πλάτων κατὰ τὴν εἰσβολὴν τοῦ
Ἐπιτραπέου "Ἐργῳ μὲν ἡμῖν οἴδ' ἔχοντι τὰ προσήκοντα σφίσιν αὐτοῖς, ὃν
τυχόντες, πορεύονται τὴν εἰμαρμένην πορείαν προπεμφθέντες κοινῇ μὲν ἀπὸ
τῆς πόλεως, ἕδρᾳ δὲ ἔκστος ἀπὸ τῶν προσηκάντων." Οὐκοῦν τὸν θάνατον
εἶτεν "εἰμαρμένην πορείαν," τὸ δὲ τετυχέκεντα τῶν νομιζομένων "προ-
πορτήν τινα δημοσίου ἵππο πατρίδος." Αρα δὴ τοῖτοι μετρίως ὕγκοσε
τὴν νόσους; γὰρ ψιλὴν λαβὼν τὴν λέξιν, ἐμελοποίησε, καθάπερ ἄρμονιαν
τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς περιφράσεως περιχεάμενος εὑμέλειαν.

[ibid.] Ἡμέν οἴδ' ἔχοντι i. e. παρ' ἡμῖν apud nos. Frequens est talis
usus prepositionis ellipsis. Homer. Il. Δ. 95. πᾶσι δέ κε Τρώεσσι
ἀρέται καὶ κύδος δρουσι. Il. Ο. 87. Θέμιστοι δέ ταλλιπαρήψ Δέκτο δέπας.
Η. Χ. 119. Τρῶσι δ' αὖ μετόπισθε γερούσιον ὄπρον ἐλαμαί. Hec. 309.
ἡμέν δ' Ἀχιλλεὺς ἄξιος τιμῆς: quia ibi annotavit Porsonus collatu digna-
sunt. Alcest. 416. ὁ Πελίου θύγατερ, Χατρονού μοι εἰν 'Αΐδη δόμοιστ,
Τὸν θανάτιον οἰκονομεῖσθαι, ubi sententia summa, pro Graecorum
more, non a verbo sed a participio exprimitur, et etiam quia Tatius
protulit, in Museo Critico p. 534. cuius ignarus huc seripsi.

[ibid.] Προπεμφθέντες. Ήταν vocula de funebri pompâ sæpe usur-
patæ. Soph. Ed. Col. 1667. Πον δ' αἱ τε παιδεῖς χ' οἱ προπέμψαντες
φέλων; Eschyl. Sept. cont. Theb. 1062. προπέμπειν ἐπὶ τὸν τύμβον.
Choeroph. 20. Ιατρὸς ἐκ δόμων ἔβην Χοᾶς προπομπὸς ὀξύχειρι σὺν κτύπῳ.
Sept. Theb. 1071. Ημεῖς μὲν ἴμερ καὶ ζυνθάψουμεν Αἴδε προπομπόν.
Hæ prosecutrices, dum funus ad sepulcrum procedebat, πανιας caue-
bant, ut ex Eur. Alcest. 624, 5. Υμεῖς δὲ τὴν θαροῦστα, ὡς νομίζεται,
Προπεκτωταρ ἔξισταν ὑστάγην δόν, accipiriūs.

[l. 11.] Τοῖοι ἔσων εὐμενὸς παρινέσσεται. Isocrates ad Demoni-
oum οὐ παράληπτιν εὐρόντες ἀλλὰ παραίστουν γράψαντες, "ex quo loco,"
inquit Augerius, "apparet per παράληπτον intelligi debere hortationem
ad eloquentiam, et per παραίστουν hortationem ad virtutem, unde hæc
oratio inscribitur πρὸς Δημόνικον παραίστου, vel παραίστηκὸς λόγος:"
Quid vult per παραίστου in subsequenti loco explicat ipse Isocrates:
Σεμβούλευεν ὃν χρῆ τὸν νεωτέρους ὄφρεγεσθαι καὶ τίνων ἔργων ἀπέχεσθαι
καὶ τοῖος τιστὶν ἀνθρώπους ὅμιλοιν ταὶ πᾶσι τὸν ἐαντῶν βίον οἰκονομεῖν.

[p. 280. 1. 2.] Αγαθοὶ δὲ ἔγενοντο διὰ τὸ φῦναι ἐξ ἀγαθῶν. Hor.
Car. iv. 4. 25. Fortes creantur fortibus et bonis: Est in juventute, est
in equis patrum Virtus, nec imbellem feroce Progenerant aquiles
columbas. "Respicit," ut verbis Valckenaeri utar, "in his nostris
questionem iustæ estate jam agitatum in Scholis Sophistarum, nepl
ἀπορεῖ, εἰ διδασκόν· quam tractarunt in Menone Plato, Eschimes Socr.
Diot. I. Plutarchus scripto libello docuit ὅτι διδασκόν η δραστ. Egregie
Quinetilius. Ingit. Orat. ali. c. 2. init. 'Virtus etiam si quosdam im-
petus ex natura sumit, tamen perficienda doctrina est:' paucis dixerat

idem Pindarum secutus Hor. Carm. iv. 4. 38. *Doctrina sed visu pre-
miovet insitam.* Euripides palmarum dat *παντοῖσιν Οὐρανοῖς διδομένην γῆν,*
ἄλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει Τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεῖ τις τὰ πάντα ὄμαις.

Οὐαὶ τοι
locis Μονκιας καὶ Ηγρόποτι σui. v. 77. egregiō, ut solet, *comfort*
Bacchis 314. Θῶξ ὁ Διόνυσος ὡς φρονεῖν ἀναγκάσσει Γιανάκειον εἰς τὴν
Κύπριν, ἀλλ' εἰ τῇ φύσει Τὸ σωφρονεῖν ἔνεστιν εἰς τὰ πάντα ὅτι Τοῦτο
σκοπεῖν χρή: quibus locis a viro doctissimo allatis hanc addas, *τοῦτον*
τὸ εὑφενες *predicas* Euripides Orest. 126. Όι φύσις, ἐν ἀνθρώποις, μέν
μέγιστη εἰς τακτὸν, Σωτῆριν τέ τοῖς καλῶν κείημένους. Iph. Aul. 561.
Θ αἱ παιδεύμεναι Μέγα φέρουσιν εἰς ἀρετὴν. Similiter Pindar. Olymp.
ii. 154—9. Σοφὸς ὁ πολλὰ εἰδὼς φυσικοῖς μαθήντες δὲ, λάβροι Παγγαλωστέοι,
κόρακες δέ, Ακραντα γαρνέμεν, Διός πρὸς ὄρνιχα θεού. Olymp. ix. 52.
τὸ δὲ φυσικὸν κράτιστον ἀπαν. Nem. iii. 69. συγγενεῖ δὲ τις εἰδόξιος μέν
βρίθει Ός δε διδάκτη ἔχει, μερῆνδες ἀνήρ.

[l. 3.] Τὴν εὐγένειαν οὖν πρῶτον αὐτῶν ἔγκυριαί ζημεν. Recte
interpretes "generosam stirpem laudemus"—ex præmissis εὐγένειαν
significasse generosam indolem quoniam putavi, immemor hujusmodi
Aristot. Rhet. H. i.e ad medium: ἡ δὲ εὐγένεια ἔντιμή τε τροφόν
ἐστι....Ἐστι δὲ εὐγένεις μὲν κατὰ τὴν τοῦ γένους ἀρετὴν γεννᾶσσε
δὲ, κατὰ τὸ μὴ ἔξιστασθαι ἐκ τῆς φυσικῆς ὥπεις ἡ επιπολὴ ἢσθιμαίστε
τοῖς εὐγένειοιν.

[l. 7.] Οὐδὲ τοὺς ἔγκυρους τούτους ἀποφηναμένη μετοίκους δὲ
τῇ χωρῇ. Notum est etiam tironibus quanto fastu τοὺς μετοίκους δὲ
spicerent veteres Attici. Aristoph. Ach. 503. Αὐτοὶ γάρ ἐσμέν δέοντες
Ληναιών τὸ ἀγῶν, Κούπια ξένοι πάρεσσιν οὐτε γάρ φόροι "Ηκουοι, οὐδὲ"
ἔκ τῶν πολέων οἱ ξύμμαχοι. Ἀλλ' ἐσμὲν αὐτοὶ νῦν γε περιπεπομένοις.
Τοὺς γάρ μετοίκους ἄχυρα τῶν ἀστῶν λέγω. Hujus inanis superbiam
eausam tradit Thucydides A. β. τὸν Ἀττικὴν ἐκ τοῦ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον διὸ
τὸ λεπτόγενων ἀσταστάτου οὐσαν, ἀνθρωποι δέοντες οἱ αὐτοὶ αἰτεῖν. Pericles
etiam in funebri sua oratione ad init. "τὴν γάρ χώραν δεῖ οἱ αὐτοὶ
οἰκηῦντες, διπολοχῆ τῶν ἐπειγυγνομένων μέχρι τούτῳ διενθέτην δι' ἀρέτην
παρέδοσαν." In hac laude jungitur M. Cicero pro Flacco loquens:
"Quae [sc. Attica] vetustate ea est ut ipse ex sese suos cives genuisse
dicatur, et eorum eadem terra patens, altrix, patrin, dicatur." Hæc
sententia, quæ Athenienses Atticæ indigentes declarat, in Homeri tem-
poribus etiam valebat, qui in navium populorumque catalogo hos
habet versus, Il. B. 545. Οἱ δέ ἦρ' Ἀθήνας εἷχον, ἔκτιμενον πολισμόν,
Δῆμόν Ἐρεχθίου μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη Θρέψε, Διός θυγάτηρ, τάκε
δὲ Σεΐδωρος ἄρουρα κ. τ. λ. Demosthenes in sua περὶ παραπρεβεῖται
oratione sic cives suos adloquitur: "μόνοι γάρ ἀπάντων ὑμεῖς αἰτόχθονες
καὶ Ἀρκάδες;" qui etiam προσέληνοι vocabantur. Talibus oratorum
historiorumque sermonibus deliniti, indignabantur Athenienses si
quis αἰτόχθοις suam verbis vel levissimis perstringeret: testis sit
infelix ille comicus poeta, quem maximā severitate mulcabant; quin, de
patre sua origine et cæteromini ex Aegypto allatis disserens, huc in-
minata adjiciebat: Αἴγυπτον τὴν πόλιν αὐτῶν πεκοικασσιν ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν.
Divo Paulῳ, ἄροιστον εἶ ἐνὸς αἵματος τῶν ἔθνος αὐτόπειν κατοκεῖν
ἐπὶ τῶν τὸ πρόσωπον τῆς γῆς, loquente, Cecropidarum οἱ μὲν ἔχεντας.
Mos etiam fuit Atheniensium, antequam res publica eorum a Solone corri-

garetur, capillos in coni speciem formare et colligere in vertice: quam exsuum metuēt tēttīγων ἐννέροις comprehendebant, ut se αἰτόχθονας hoc argumento indicarent; cuius rei in Ciridis poemate meminit Virgilius: "Ergo omnis caro residebat cura capillo, Aurea solemani coenitum quem fibula ritu Cecropiæ tereti necetebat dente cicadæ:" neque pliter Thucydides A. st. Χρυσῶν τεττίγων ἐν ἑρσει κρωβύλον συδιδύσκοι τῶν ἐν τῷ κεφαλῇ τριχῶν.

[I. 10.] Καὶ τρεφομένους οὐχ ὥπο μητριᾶς. Metaphora ab inimicitia quam erga privignos suos habuisse narrantur apud veteres novercæ; in multis locis μητριὰ idem quod "exitium" vel "exitialis" sonat. Eustath. ad II. E. p. 560. 19. μητριὰ—ἥτοι ἔχθρα καὶ ὀλέθριοι. Hesiōd. "Ἀλλοτε μητριὰ πέλει ἡμέρα, ἄλλοτε μήτηρ." Eschyl. Prom. Vincl. 752. Σαλμιδησία γνάθος Ἐχθρόκενος ναύταιοι, μητριὰ νεῦν. Antholog. Lib. I. 50. Μητριὰ προγόνοισιν ἀεὶ κάκον· οὐδὲ φιλοῦσαι Σώζονται γνάθοι καὶ Ἰππόλιτον. Eur. fragment. Ός οὐδὲν ὑπει φασι μητριὰς φρονεῖν Νόθοις παῖσιν, ἀν φυλάξουμαι ψύχον. Sic etiam Latini de novercali studio putaverunt. Virgilii Georg. II. 126. "Media sunt tristes succos tardumque soporem Felicis mali, quo non præsentius ullum, Pocula si quando sœvæ infecere novercæ, Miscueruntque herbas et non innoxia pocta, Auxilium venit et membris agit atra venenum." Ecl. III. 33. "Est mihi namque domi pater, est *injusta* noverca." Hor. Epop. V. 9. "Quid, ut noverca, me intueris, aut uti Petita ferro bellua." Ovid Metam. I. 147. "Lurida terribiles miscent aconita novercæ." Juv. in Sat. vi. 627. sic de fœminis loquitur: "Qderunt natos de pellice; nemo recuset, Nemo velat, jamjam privignum occidere fas est."—Tac. Annal. i. 10. "Postremò Livia gravis in rempublicam mater, gravior domui Cæsarum noverca." Idem fermè usus est vocis "patruus." Hor. Sat. II. iii. 88. "Ne sis patruus mihi" i. e. "ne sis severus." In alio loco "Iratum patrum, vicinos, te tibi iniquum." Carm. III. xii. 3. "Exanimari metuentes patruæ verbera linguæ."

[I. 12.] Καὶ νῦν κεῖσθαι τελευτήσαντες ἐν οἰκεῖοις τόποις τῆς τεκούσης. Magnum apud veteres malum putabatur si quispiam in exterā regione moreretur, quod colligas ex sequente anonymi cuiusdam epigrammate, Eis αἴδην ιθέα κατήλυσις, εἰτ' ἀπ' Ἀθηνῶν Στελχεῖς, εἴτε νέκυς κείσθαι ἐξ Μερόης. Μή τέ γ' ἀνιάτῳ πάτρῃς ἀπὸ τῆλε θανόντα. Πάντοθεν εἰς ὁ φέρων εἰς Ἀΐδην ἀνεμος. His epigramma a Demosthene in τῷ περὶ στεφάνου oratione citatum addas, ubi super hæc mortuis gratulatur, quod Γαῖα—παρὶς ἔχει κόλπους τῶν πλείστα γαμόντων Σώματα.

[I. 13.] Υποδεξαμένης male reddiderunt interpres "quæ excepit." Non, si quid ego recti video, sed "quæ aluit."

[p. 281. l. 4.] Ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ ἐν φῇ τῷ τάσα γῇ ἀνεδίδων καὶ δὴ πᾶν παντοδαπά. Hic latet menda, nulli editorum adhuc obser- vata. Δην. in sensu transitivo planè solœcum est: tu mecum reponas δηνα, quænamvis ne sic quidem, ut mihi videtur, rectus extet textus—. Quid si ἀνεδίδων primariam esse lectionem, pro quæ καὶ δηνα fuit glossa, dicamus? quæ glossa, librariorum oscitantia, postea in textum irrepit—Quod sententiam, terram olim efferaτa animalia edidisse docet Eschylus in Suppl. 261. "Ἄτις γὰρ ἐλθὼν ἐκ πέρας Ναυαρτίας

Ιατρόμαντις ταῦ Ἀπόλλωνος, χθόνα Τήνδ' ἐκκαθαίρει συρδάλων βρο-
γοφθόρων Τα δὴ πολαιῶν αἰμάτων μάσμασι Χρυσότει¹ θύμη² γέλει
μηνιη³ δάκη Δράκονθ⁴ δμιλον, δυσμενή ξυνοκίαν. Μηντῆ⁵ θάνατον
berrima Porsoni emendatio est pro μηνῇ καὶ δάκῃ.

[l. 7.] Ἐξελέχαστο δὲ τὸν ζώαν καὶ ἔγεννησεν ἀνθρώπου, δ' ὅντες
σει, κ. τ. λ. Cf. Longinum §. 35. Ἡ φύσις οὐ γαπεῖνὸν ἡμᾶς έργον, τοῦ
ἀγεννές ἔκρινε τὸν ἀνθρώπου. Eurip. Med. Πάντων δ' οὐδεὶς τούτοις
καὶ γνωμὴν ἔχει Γυναῖκες ἐπημὲν ἀθλιώτατον φυτόν. Theoc. Κορανοί
37. Κράναι καὶ βοτάναι, γλυκερὸν φυτόν. cf. Ovid. Metam. 11. 102.
Quid meruere boves, animal sine fraude dolisque. Juven. Sat. 11. 140. Quanta est gula quæ sibi totos Ponit apros, animal propter
vivia natum.

[l. 8.] Καὶ δίκην καὶ θεοὺς μόνον νομίζει. cf. Xenophon. Memorab.
lib. i. ad initium Ὡς οὐκ ἐνόμιζεν Σωκράτης, οὐδὲ οὐ πόλις νομίζει, θεούς.
Med. 493. Θεοὺς νομίζεις τοὺς τότ' οὐκ ἄρχειν ἔτι; cf. quoque Herod.
bam, 799, 800. Ἄλλ' οἱ θεοὶ οὐδένοντι καὶ κείνων κρατῶν Νόμος·
γὰρ τοὺς θεοὺς ἡγούμεθα.

[l. 12.] Ὡς καὶ γυνὴ δύλη τεκοῦσά τε ἀληθῶς, καὶ μὴ, διλλ' ὑποθέ-
λομένη. Latinè, Quo planè discernitur mulier illa quæ peperit, ab ali-
quæ infantem supposuit. Talis τοῦ ὑποβάλλεσθαι sensus haud est
infrequens, et crimen, quod ea vocula denotat, nil nisi seculum perti-
batur, quod ex sequentibus locis colligas. Thesm. 339. mala ei devo-
ventur δοτις ἐπιβούλευεν Ἡ τὸν τύραννον ἐνυκατάγειν, ἡ ταΐδον ὑπο-
βαλλομένης κατειπέ τις. Ibid. 407. Eleus. γυνὴ τις ὑποβάλλεσθαι βούλε-
ται, Ἀτοροῦσα παῖδων; οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἔστιν λαθεῖν. Luculentam sane de
hoc criminis ab ejusdem fabulæ 505. historiam habebis, quem videbas.
Phœn. 30. Ἡ δὲ τὸν ἐμὸν ὕδινων πόνον Μάστοις ὑφείτο, quæ rē est
prorsus alia.

[l. 15.] Μόνη γὰρ—ηγεγέ τὸν τῶν πυρῶν καὶ κριθῶν καρπόν. Luculent.
lib. vi. 1. “Prinæ frugiferos fetus mortalibus ægris Dididerunt quoniam
dam præclaro nomine Athenæ: Et recreaverunt vitam legesque ro-
garunt.”

[p. 282. l. 3.] Τούτου τοῦ καρποῦ οὐκ ἐφθύνησεν. Hujus Syntaxis
paucia invenies exempla. Prom. Vinct. 603—4. μηδὲ μοι Φθονήσει
εἴγυμάτων, ἀναξ. Hercoul. Furens. 333. κοσμεῖθ' ἔσω μολόντες· οὐ
φθονῷ περιῶν. Hunc Græcismum imitatur Horat. Sat. II. vi. 83, 84:
neque illi Sepositi ciceris nec longæ invidit avenæ. Interdum etiam
accusativum post se adsciscit CEdip. Tyr. 310. οὐ δ' οὖν φθονήσεις μήτ
ἀπ' εἰωνῶν φάτειν, κ. τ. λ.

[l. 4.] Ἐδαίσιν γένεσιν, πόνων ἀρωγῆν—ut cibi, non, sicut in poste-
ris temporibus, gymnasii usus ministraret, cf. Psalm. civ. 15.

[l. 7.] Ων τὰ μὲν ὄντατα······κατεσκείασαν. In communibus
editionibus hic locus male interpungitur. Tu necum sic legas et in-
terpungas. Ων τὰ μὲν ὄντατα πρέπει ἐν τῷ τοιῷδε ἔχειν (σομεν γάρ)
οἱ τὸν βίον ἡρῶν κατεσκείασαν—Quam saepè hæc verba σομεν γάρ in
sententia διάφεσον ponuntur, non est qui ignoret: notius est quam ut
exemplis illustreret.

[p. 283.] Η γάρ αὐτή πολιτεία καὶ τότε ἡν καὶ τὸν ἀριστοράριθμον.
Vide quæ in sub-priestantissimâ et longe longèque omnes alias supe-

tante historia de diversa Graecorum poliureis Mitfordius habet, tom. i. cap. iv. sect. 1. Locus est nimis longus ut excratur, et in compendium sine detimento redigi non potest.

[l. 2.] Καλεῖ δὲ ὁ μὲν αὐτὴν δημοκρατίαν. cf. Thueyd. lib. ii. λ. 2. ubi Pericles in funebri suā oratione Ηά loquitur, Χρύσεβα γὰρ πολιτείη, οὐ Εὐδοσηρού τούς τέλας νόμους, παράδειγμα δὲ αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον ὅντες τιοῦ πρόσφροντος ἐτέρους· καὶ ὄντα μὲν, διὰ τὸ μῆ eis οἰλίγους ἀλλ' eis πλεονεῖς οἰκεῖν Δημοκρατία καλεῖται—ubi alii sed male legunt ηκεῖν {q. sensum verbi οἰκεῖν}.

[l. 4.] Βασιλεῖς μὲν γὰρ ἡσήνειν εἰσιν. Quæ apud veteres Graecos plutonium valebat auctoritas, sicut regalis. Thueyd. A. i. γ. Δυνατόπερας δὲ γενουέντης τῆς Ἑλλάδος, καὶ τῶν χρημάτων τὴν κτήσιν ἔτι μᾶλλον ἢ πρότερον ποιουμένης, τὰ πολλὰ τυραννίδες ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καθίσταστο, εὐθὺς προσδόμων μεζόνων γεγομένων πρότερον δὲ ἡσαν ἐπὶ ἥρτοῖς γέρασι παρικαὶ βασιλέαται.

[l. 7.] Καὶ οὕτε ἀποθενεῖται, κ. τ. λ. Pericles in fun. Orat. Thuc. Γ.
κατὰ δὲ κατὰ μὲν τοὺς νόμους, πρὸς τὰ ἴδια διάφορα πᾶσι τῷ ἰσον, δὲ τὴν ἀξίωσιν, ὡς ἔκαπος ἐν τῷ εἰδοκεῖται, οὐκ ἀπὸ μέρους τὸ πλεῖον δὲ τὰ κουνὶ ἢ ἀπὸ ὀρεῇς προτιμᾶται οὐδὲ αὐτὸν κατὰ πενίαν, ἔχων δέ τι ἀγαθὸν δρᾶσαι τὴν πόλιν ἀξιώματος ἀφαιρεῖται κακάτωται.

[l. 13.] "Ωστε αὐτῶν ἀνώμαλοι καὶ αἱ πολιτεῖαι, τυραννίδες τὲ καὶ διγυαρχίαι, " ὅμαλὸς seu ὅμαλής planus, æqualis—ὅμαλής διπτα æqualitas civilis; cui πλεονεξία oppositur, seu plus habendi, acquirendique cupiditas immodica, avaritiaque circumscribens, quæ sibi partem magjorem justa præcedit: est vitium ejus, qui in omni re præcipuum quippiam habere vult"—Budæns. cf. etiam de sententiâ Dem. Olynth. A. sect. β. δῆλος ἀπιστον ταῖς πολιτεῖαις ἡ τυραννίς.

[l. 16.] Οὐκ ἀξιούμεν δοῦλοι οὐδὲ δεσπόται ἀλλήλων εἴναι. Ad illustranda hæc verba asseram verba Xenophont. Cyrop. iii. p. 178. 37. οὐδένα ἀνθρωπου δεσπότην, ἀλλὰ τοὺς θεοὺς προσκυνεῖτε.

[p. 284.] "Ο τε χρόνος βραχὺς ἀξιως διηγησοθει. i. e. ἀγαν βραχύς.
—Nimis angustum tempus est pro dignitate referre." Similia hujus constructionis exempla concessit Wytenbachius ad Julianum in Bibliotheca Crit. III. ii. 65. v. c. Xenophon Cyrop. iv. 5. 8. ὀλίγοι θεμεν ὥστε ἐγκριτεῖς εἴραν αὐτῶν. Mein. Soer. III. 13. 3. θῶρ—ψυχρὸν ὥστε λούσασθαι, "Aqua frigidior quam ut quis eā lavari possit." Platō Protag. p. 195. ἡμεῖς γὰρ ἔτι νέοι ὥστε τοσούτον πρᾶγμα διελέθωται. Euripið. Androm. p. 80. γέρων ἑκεῖνος, ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν πάρων. "Senior est quam ut te præsens juvare possit," ubi plena esset locutio μᾶλλον γέρων (γεραίτερος) ἐστὶν ἑκεῖνος ἢ ὥστε σ' ὠφελεῖν πάρων.

[p. 285. l. 1.] Τούτων περὶ μοὶ δοκεῖ χρῆναι ἐπιμνησθῆναι, ἐπανόθιτα τε κ. τ. λ. Recte Tatius ad Medeam, v. 56. in Dalzelii collectaneis hæc annotat: "Cum dativus nominis præcedit, sequi potest accusativus adjectivi aut participii; at non versa vice," quod quidem, addit Dalzelius, verum est tum apud Graecos tum apud Latinos scriptores. Utinam hujusce apud Latinos constructionis exempla pauca adpudixisset! In Graecis ubique patent; satis est unum ex Iphig. in Aulide, v. 492. adhibuisse, quod non fecissem, nisi Marklandum levissimè (sed tamen ex levibus pendent magna) errantem vidissem.

Locus hic est. "Άλλως τε μ' ἔλεος τῆς ταλαιπώρου φύσης. Εἰσῆλθε, στρυγένεται ἐννοομένηρ, ubi hæc habet Marklandus, "Forte ἐννοάμενον ut ver. 1374. οἵ εἰσῆλθέν μ' ἐννοομένην. Græcum foret εἰσῆλθε μοι ἐννοομένῳ: sed mihi non liquet μ' ponī posse pro μοι." Nec potest: sed rem, vir doctissime, minus perspectè intellexisti: magis est Tragicorum more εἰσῆλθέν με—ἐννοομένῳ quam εἰσῆλθέν με ἐννοομένην scripsisse. Mutatio e casu genitivo ad accusativum satis rara occurrit in Demosthenis Olynth. B. 7. Οὐ τοι σωφρόνιν, οὐδὲ γενναίων ἐστιν ἀνθρώπων ἐλλείποντά τι δι' ἐνδειαν χρημάτων πολέμου, εὐχερῶς τὰ τοιαῦτα ὄνειδη φέρειν οὐδὲ ἐπὶ μὲν Κορινθίους καὶ Μεγαρίας, ἀπτάσσαντας τὰ ὅπλα πορεύεσθαι, Φιλιππον δέ ἐξ τοῖς Εὐρυνίδας ἀνδραποδίσασθαι. Hoc uno excepto, nullum locum in proposito habeo ubi hæc casuum mutatio invenitur.

[l. 8.] Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ιδεῖν, εἰ μέλλει τὶς καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενόμενον λόγῳ ὅτε πᾶσα μὲν, κ. τ. λ. Male hunc locum interpretarunt et interpretati sunt editores. "Eam utique si quis recte laudaturus sit, oportet res ab illis eo tempore gestas respicere quācumque jam," &c. ubi interpres γενόμενον, quasi τὸ γενόμενον suisset, intellexit. Tu mecum sic construas et interpungas, Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ιδεῖν, εἰ μέλλει τὶς καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν, ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενόμενον λόγῳ, ὅτε, κ. τ. λ. "Eam utique si quis recte laudaturus sit, oportet eum ad ea tempora animo procedentem videre, quum," &c. Hujus τοῦ γένεσθαι usus occurrit alterum in hac ipsa oratione exemplum, p. 287. l. 6. ἐν τούτῳ δὴ ἡ τὶς γενόμενος γνοΐν οἷον ἄρα ἐτύχανον ὅτις τὸν ἀρετὴν, κ. τ. λ. quem locum recte ad sensum, quācumvis non ad grammaticam constructionem verterunt editores. Aeschines κατὰ Κτησιφωντος μή. Γεγονέσθε διὰ μοι μικρὸν χρόνον τὴν διάνοιαν μὴ ἐν τῷ δικαιητηρίῳ ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ νομίσατε ὥρᾳ τὸν κίρυκα.—cf. ibid. Σ. προσέλθετε οὖν τῇ διάνοᾳ καὶ εἰς τὴν στοὰν—Thucyd. lib. iii. μ. Γενόμενοι δὲ ὅτι ἐγγύτατα τῷ γνώμῃ τοῦ πάσχειν, καὶ ὡς πρὸ παντὸς ἡτοι ἐπιμήσασθε αὐτοὺς χειρόσασθαι, quem locum sic optime vertit in sua Anglicæ Thucydidis versione ille "verus Musarum sacerdos," [cf. Toup. ad Long.] Haber-tus Smith, Decanus Cestriensis, "Figure to yourselves as strong as you can the miseries they designed you: remember how you wished for nothing in this world so much as to have them in your power."—

Si meam hujusce loci interpretationem averseris, scias Stephanum totum locum sic refinxisse. Δεῖ δὴ αὐτὴν ιδεῖν εἰ μέλλει τὶς καλῶς ἐπαινεῖν. Ἐν ἑκείνῳ τῷ χρόνῳ γενόμενην λέγω, ὅτι—Leviori mutatione huic loco, si locus non sit sanus et mihi certe sanissimus apparuit, medebatur Gottl. ita ut post ἐπαινεῖν inseratur articulus τὸ et λόγῳ referatur ad ἐπαινεῖν.

[l. 9.] Ή Ἀσία ἐδούλευε τρίτῳ ἡδη βασιλεῖ, viz. Dario Hystaspis filio: nam Cyrus Persarum imperium munivit: hunc Cambyses, Cambysem breve post intervallum excipiebat Darius; hæc observatio Edvardo Bentham debetur, cujus editoris nota laudem non mereruntur. Aeschylus qui tunc temporis, quum Asia omnis tertio iam regi serviebat, floruit, Persicorum regum stemma sic deducit, ex quo licet intueri eum a Platone Platonisque defensore Benthamo multum discrepare—Persæ, v. 759—777. (Editionis Schutzianæ) Ή

οὗτε τιμὴν Ζεὺς ἄναξ τήνδ' ὑπασεν, "Ἐν' ἄγδρ' ἀπάσης Ἀστάδδος μηδοτρόφου Ταγέῖν, ἔχοντα σκῆπτρον εὐθυτῆριον. Μῆδοι γὰρ ἦν ὁ πρώτος ἡγεμῶν στρατοῦ" Ἀλλος δ' ἐκείνου παῖς τοδ' ἔργον ἤνυσεν, Φρένες γὰρ αὐτοῦ θυμὸν οἰακοστρόφουν. Τρίτος δ' ἀπ' αὐτοῦ Κύρος, εὐδαιμων ἀνὴρ, "Αρξας ἔθηκε πᾶσιν εἰρήνην φίλοις· Λιθῶν δὲ λαὸν καὶ Φρυγῶν ἐκτήσατο, Ιωνιαν τε πᾶσιν ἥλασεν βίᾳ· Θεὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἡχθηρεν, ὡς εὑφρων ἔφην. Κύρου δὲ παῖς, τέταρτος ἡγεμῶν στρατόν. Πέμπτος δὲ Μέρδης ἡρέεν, πλειστὴν πάτρη, Θρύναισι τ' ἀρχαίσιοις τὸν δὲ [mel. τόνδε] σὺν δόλῳ Ἀργαφρένης ἐκτείνεν ἐσθλὸς ἐν δόμοις, Ξὺν ἀνδράσιν φίλοισιν, οἷς τοδ' οὐ χρέος. "Ἐκτος δὲ Μάραφις, ἐβδομός τ' Ἀργαφρένης. Κάγῳ [sc. Darius, quā loquitur] πάλον τ' ἔκυρσα, τοῦτον ἥθελον, Κίτηπτράτεντα πολλὰ σὺν πολλῷ στρατῷ—ubi notandum est me in versu 771. Rutgersii emendationem τοῦ Μέρδης pro Μάρδος accepisse; "nomen enim Mardi in Persicarum regum serie," verbis utor Brunckianis, "nullibi componet." Ex Herodoto satis notus Σμέρδης est. Nominis primam literam extirvit metri necessitas, quod in aliis vocibus usitatum est ut in admissis soni verbo σμέρδω, μέρδω. Emendationi faveat Scholiastes.

Hec pro specimen, ut verba Burgesii usurpem, sufficient: alio tempore telam quam orsi sumus persequemur.

G. T. X.

NOTICE OF

A GRAMMAR of the PERSIAN LANGUAGE, comprising a portion of ARABIC Inflection, together with some observations on the structure of either Language, considered with reference to the Principles of General Grammar. By M. LUMSDEN, LL.D. Professor of Arabic and Persian in the College of Fort William, in Bengal. 2 Vols. fol. Calcutta, 1810.

We cannot better explain the motives which induced the author to undertake this elaborate work on Persian Grammar, than by offering the following extract from his own Preface: a brief outline of the subject matter will afterwards be added from the Table of Contents, and in some future Number of our Journal we may probably be induced to offer a few remarks upon the intricate, but novel, and interesting subjects of discussion, with which the ingenious author has in so remarkable a manner characterized his work.

"The public," says Dr. Lumsden,¹ "have long been in possession of several Persian Grammars, among the number of which that written by Sir W. Jones has obtained the greatest share of celebrity. The work of Sir W. Jones was composed in England about forty years ago, in the very infancy of our progress in the study of the language and literature of Persia, and whatever merits or defects may be imputed to this popular performance, it must be admitted to have extended in a very eminent degree the number of European votaries to that department of oriental study.

"How it contributed to this effect, it is not necessary to inquire here. My opinion of its execution is by no means favorable, but I respect the memory of Sir W. Jones, and am entirely disposed to admit that the obvious and, perhaps at that time, insuperable difficulties with which he had to contend, are more than sufficient to account for his failure, if indeed he can be said to have failed in a work which has been always distinguished by the public favor, (conceded perhaps to the poetical talents and taste of the author,) though not at all remarkable, in my judgment, for the essential merit of instructive excellence.

"The work of Sir W. Jones was followed, after an interval of many years, by the publication of Mr. Gladwin's PERSIAN MOONSHEE; a performance in which for the first time some of the elements of Arabic Inflection were selected and arranged for the useful purpose of facilitating the study of the Persian language. Notwithstanding the merit of that and other performances of the same author, for whose

¹ See Preface, p. 1 and 2.

labor I am happy in this opportunity of professing my esteem, an opinion continued to prevail in the minds of many oriental scholars that much yet remained to be done for the elucidation of the principles of Persian Grammar. Admitting the accuracy of that opinion, the acknowledged importance of the Persian language demanded an attempt to supply the deficiency, and if such an attempt were admitted to be necessary, its execution could be no where so reasonably expected as from some of the members of the College of Fort William.

"I happened to be the only member of the Arabic and Persian departments of the College, who had leisure from other pursuits to devote to the compilation of a Persian Grammar; but though the task was deemed to be of easy accomplishment by those who had little knowledge of the subject, I was well aware of its many difficulties, and ignorant only of the means by which those difficulties have, as I trust, been since overcome. I would therefore have willingly conceded to the superior knowledge and talents of others, the merit and labor of a work to which I was prompted by no impulse of inclination whatever; but as it was imposed by a sense of public duty, so it has been conducted throughout, I will venture to say, with an industry of research every where equal to the occasion of its exertion, and often rewarded with no ordinary success."

We now proceed to the plan and arrangement of the materials as given by the author himself. "The science of Grammar," he observes, "is every where divided into the two branches of INFLECTION and SYNTAX, the first treating of the *formation* of words; and the second of their *application* to the purposes of speech. The materials of both are precisely the same, but the object to be accomplished is obviously different in either case. It is the business of INFLECTION to arrange in their proper order, every class of words that may happen to enter into the composition of a given language; to define the specific difference existing between them; and to detail the rules applicable to the formation of each class. It is the business of SYNTAX to consider in the same order the application of these words to the purposes of speech."

The first volume accordingly is devoted to INFLECTION, and comprises the following heads:—The Persian Alphabet and System of Orthography—Of Numeral Letters—Of the Terms by which certain letters of the alphabet are distinguished from each other—Permutation of letters. Of the Infinitive and the formation of the Tenses—Inflection of Verbs—Terms of Grammar—Of Arabic Words—Preliminary remarks (on the permutation of Arabic Letters)—Rules for the permutation and rejection of Humza—Rules for the permutation and rejection of Alif, Wao, and Ya—Rules for the Coalescence of the Letters—Concluding Remarks—Division and Classification of Arabic Nouns—Primitive Infinitives of the Trilateral Class—Derivative Nouns—Increased Infinitives of the Trilateral Class—Quadrilateral Infinitives of the radical Class—Increased Infinitives of the Quadrilateral Class—Properties of the Conjugations—Of Jaumids—Relative Nouns—Arti-

ficial Infinitives—Of Gender—Of Number—Formation of the Dual Number—Perfect Plural—Imperfect Plural—The Plural of Punciety—The Plural of Multitude—The last of Plurals—Noun of the Plural—Conclusion—Of the formation of the singular Number, by adding certain letters to Nouns which have naturally a Plural Sense—Of Nouns defective in the Singular Number—Of Arabic Plurals used by the Persians in the sense of the Singular Number—Of the Principles of Analysis—Of certain Arabic Words and Sentences that are of common use in the Persian Language—Conclusion—Of Persian Nouns—Hasile Musdar—Isme Faal or Active Participle—Isme Mufool or Passive Participle—Isme Hal—Sefute Mooshabba—Isme Zurf or Noun of Time and Place—Isme Tufzeet or Noun of Superiority—Isme Tusgheer or Diminutive Noun—Isme Munsoob or Persian Relative—Of Terminations—Formation of the Plural Numbers.

In this volume we would particularly direct the reader's attention to Dr. Lumsden's ingenious observations on the Division and Classification of Arabic Nouns, p. 136, including his Definition of an Arabic INFINITIVE, and remarks on the nature of ADJECTIVES, PRINCIPLES and EPITHETS, as classed together under the general term صفات or ATTRIBUTES; and lastly to his PRINCIPLES OF ANALYSIS, p. 383, which seem intended by the author to overthrow some of the favorite dogmas of Horne Tooke, on the true nature and logical division of the Parts of Speech.

The Contents of the *Second Volume* are as follow:

Introductory Chapter—Of Particles—Plan of the Syntax—Composition and Division of Sentences—Of Personal Pronouns—Disjunctive Personal Pronouns—Reciprocal Pronouns—Demonstrative Nouns—The Relative Pronoun—Interrogative Pronouns—Noun of Time and Place—Generic Nouns, (including the use of Articles.) Proper Names—Nouns of Number—Collective Nouns—Kenayat—Aswaut—Ithbaa—Subject and Predicate—Faal or Agent to an Active or Neuter Verb—Nominative to a Verb in the Passive Voice—Object of an Active and Transitive Verb—Universal Object—Vocative—Haul or Noun employed to describe the state of the Agent or object of a Verb—Tumeez or Noun of Discrimination—Corroboration—Exchange of one Word for another—The Relation of the Genitive Case—Substantive Nouns accompanied by Attributives of any kind—Noun of Superiority—Of the Verbal Character—Imperfect Verbs—Perfect Verbs—Application of Tenses—The Imperative Mood—The Prohibitive—General Principle—On Verbs considered as Active or Neuter—On the interchange of Persons—Occasional Omission of Persian Verbs—The relation existing between the طَرْف and the طَرْف—Of Particles—Of the significance of certain Letters of the Alphabet—Of Persian Particles and other Words comprising more than one letter.

The mere contents of this volume as stated in the above table, may satisfy the oriental scholar as to the magnitude and importance of the matter contained in Dr. Lumsden's Grammar. It is certainly a very different work from any that we have ever seen on the subject of Lan-

guage, not excepting even the voluminous Treatise of Vossius, or the still more recondite philosophical dissertation of Harris. It presents, as he himself observes, ‘a complete Map of the Persian Language’—not merely a rude outline, but an effective body of Rules and Examples from the authority of which there ought to be no appeal.’

The observations scattered through the body of the work on the structure of the Persian and Arabic Languages, considered with reference to the principles of general Grammar, are extremely ingenious and interesting, and well merit the attentive consideration of every true critic. Mr. Lumsden has found it necessary to oppose some of the long standing Theories of European Writers on language, and has combated with no ordinary skill the favorite doctrine of Horne Tooke, on the true nature and use of Particles, the structure of the Arabic Language, presenting in his opinion, an insuperable barrier against the admission of Tooke’s principles on the broad basis of Universal Grammar.

خبر الكلام مقال ودلل خبر ازین کفته اند اهل سلف
that Dr. Lumsden had some good reason for applying it to his book. To be sure ELEVEN HUNDRED FOLIO PAGES may not be deemed by every one a very remarkably laconic essay, but the author may have intended the words as a compliment to the *perspicuous brevity* of the Persian Tongue, and if that were his intention, we give him full credit for the unambiguous motto he has chosen for his second volume.

پیش ازین کفته اند اهل سلف

عذر من صنف قد استهداف

T.

NOTICE OF

THE MEGHA DUTA, or “CLOUD MESSENGER,” a Poem in the Sanscrit Language: by CALIDASA. Translated into English Verse, with Notes and Illustrations: by HORACE HAYMAN WILSON, Assistant Surgeon in the service of the Honorable East India Company, and Secretary to the Asiatic Society. Calcutta, 1813. 4to. 132 pages.

THERE is reason to believe that the very high encomium bestowed on this work by the late Lord Minto,¹ had excited in many persons

¹ See the “Public Disputation of the Students of the College of Fort William,” &c. 20th Sept. 1813.—pp. 39. 40. &c.

here a strong desire of perusing it, long before any copies reached this country. We have now the pleasure of announcing, that the *Megha Duta* has not only arrived in England, but most completely establishes its claim to the praises which it received from the noble and ingenious critic abovementioned.

The limits prescribed to us in the present number of the *Classical Journal* will not admit a particular notice of the various beauties which embellish the "*Cloud Messenger*;" we shall therefore content ourselves here, with a brief account of the plot, which may best be given in the words of Mr. Wilson's own "argument." (p. xi.)

"A *Yacsha*, or demigod so called, and a servant of the *Hindu* god of wealth, *Civera*, had incurred the displeasure of his lord, by neglecting a garden intrusted to his charge, and allowing it to be injured by the entrance of *Airavata*, the elephant of *Indra*, deity of the firmament: as a punishment for his offence, he was condemned to twelve months' banishment from *Alaca*, the city of the *Yacshas*, and consequent separation from his home and wife. The seat of his exile is the mountain *Ramagiri*, and upon the opening of the poem, he is supposed to have passed a period of eight months in solitary seclusion: the poem opens at the commencement of the rainy season, when heavy clouds are gathering in the south, and proceeding in a northerly course, or towards the *Himala* mountains, and the fictitious position of the residence of the *Yacshas*. To one of these the distressed demi-god addresses himself, and desires the cloud to waft his sorrows to a beloved and regretted wife. For this purpose, he first describes the route which the messenger is to pursue, and this gives the poet an opportunity of alluding to the principal mountains, rivers, temples, &c. that are to be met with on the road from *Ramagiri* to *Oujin*, and thence nearly due north, to the *Himalaya*, or "snowy mountains." The fabulous mountain *Cailasa*, and the city of *Civera*, *Alaca*, which are supposed to be in the central part of the snowy range, are next described, and we then come to the personal description of the *Yacsha's* wife. The cloud is next instructed, how to express the feelings and situation of the exile, and he is then dismissed from the presence of the deity, and the poem of *Calidasa*."

The banished *Yacsha*, after due oblations, thus addresses the cloud, —(line 37.)

"Hail! friend of *Indra*, counsellor divine,
Illustrious offspring of a glorious line;
Wearer of shapes at will; thy worth I know,
And bold entrust thee with my fated woe.
For better far solicitation fail
With high desert, than with the base prevail.
Thou art the wretch's aid, affliction's friend;
To me, unfortunate, thy succour lend:
My lonely state compassionate behold,
Who mourn the vengeance of the god of gold:

Condemned amidst these dreary rocks to pine,
And all I wish, and all I love resign.

Where dwell the *Yacshas* in their sparkling fields,
And *Sina's* crescent groves surrounding gilds,
Direct thy licensed journey, and relate
To her who mourns in *Alaca* my fate :
There shalt thou find the partner of my woes,
True to her faith, and stranger to repose :
Her task to weep our destiny severe,
And count the moments of the lingering year :
A painful life she leads ; but still she lives,
While Hope its aid invigorating gives :
For female hearts, though fragile as the flower,
Are firm when closed by Hope's investing power."

The Sanscrit text accompanies in each page Mr. Wilson's translation, and the obscure or most interesting passages are illustrated with a multiplicity of notes that sufficiently bespeak his critical knowledge of the Sanscrit tongue — his extensive reading and rich stores of miscellaneous information. We shall transcribe the note on verse 39, in the passage above quoted, "Wearer of shapes at will." — "Or *Cama-rupa*, from *kam*, desire, and *rup*, form, shape; — thus, *Socrates* in the Clouds,

"Σο. Τινοταὶ πειθό ὅτι βόλωνται.

"Soc. Why then,

Clouds can assume what shapes they will, believe me."

Cumberland's Translation.

and the note on verse 40. ("For better far solicitation fail," &c.). This is a sentiment of rather an original strain, and indicates considerable elevation of mind; something of the same kind occurs in Massinger's play of the *Bondman*, where Pisander says,

"I'd rather fall under so just a judge,
Than be acquitted by a judge corrupt,
And partial in his censure."

Although obliged to restrict this notice to very narrow limits, we cannot refrain from extracting some lines of the *Yacsha's* instructions to his celestial messenger, (v. 515, p. 85.)

"These be thy guides; and faithfully preserve
The marks I give thee; or e'en more; observe,
Where painted emblems holy wealth design,
Cuvera's treasures; that abode is mine.
Haply its honors are not now to boast;
Dimmed by my fate, and in my exile lost.
For when the sun withdraws his cheering rays,
Faint are the charms the *Camala* displays.
To those loved scenes repaired, that awful size,
Like a young elephant, in haste disguise,

Lest terror seize my fair one, as thy form
Hangs o'er the hillock and portends the storm.
Thence to the inner mansion bend thy sight,
Diffusing round a mild and quivering light,
As when through evening shades soft flashes play,
Where the bright fire-fly wings his glittering way.
There in the fane a beauteous creature stands,
The first best work of the Creator's hands,
Whose slender limbs inadequately bear
A full-orbed bosom, and a weight of care;
Whose teeth like pearls, whose lips like bimbæ show,
And fawn-like eyes still tremble as they glow.
Lone as the widowed *Chacrvati* mourns,
Her faithful memory to her husband turns,
And sad and silent shalt thou find my wife,
Half of my soul, and partner of my life,
Nipped by chill sorrow, as the flowers enfold
Their shrinking petals from the withering cold.
I view her now! long weeping swells her eyes,
And those dear lips are dried by parching sighs.
Sad on her hand her pallid cheek declines,
And half unseen through veiling tresses shines.
As when a darkling night the moon enshrouds,
A few faint rays break straggling through the clouds.
Now at thy sight, I mark fresh sorrows flow,
And sacred sacrifice augments her woe;
I mark her now, with fancy's aid retrace
This wasted figure, and this haggard face;
Now from her favorite bird she seeks relief,
And tells the tuneful *Sarica* her grief,
Mourns o'er the feathered prisoner's kindred fate,
And fondly questions of its absent mate.
In vain the lute for harmony is strung,
And round the robe-neglected shoulder slung,
And faltering accents strive to catch in vain
Our race's old commemorative strain;
The falling tear, that from reflection springs,
Corrodes incessantly the silvery strings.
Recurring woe still pressing on the heart,
The skilful hand forgets its grateful art,
And idly wandering strikes no measured tone,
But wakes a sad, wild warbling of its own."

On the verse 532, ("The first best work," &c.) Mr. Wilson remarks, Literally the first creation of *Brahma*: and *first* may refer to time, to degree—it most probably here means *best*. So Milton, speaking of Eve,

' Oh fairest of creation, last and best
Of all God's works.' *Parad. Lost*, ix. 896."

On verse 535, he observes, that "the *Bimba*, (*Bryoxia grandis*) bears a red fruit, to which the lip is very commonly compared."

On verse 537, that "the *Chacraraci* is the ruddy goose (*Anas Casarca*) more commonly known in India by the appellation *Brahmany duck, or goose*. These birds are always observed to fly in pairs during the day, but are supposed to remain separate during the night," &c.

On verse 543, ("*Long weeping swells her eyes.*")—"In this she resembles the *Lesbia* of Catullus,

' Flendo turbiduli rubent ocelli.'

' Her swollen eyes are red with weeping.'

On verse 557, ("*In vain the lute.*")—"The lute is here put for the *Veena* or *Been*, a stringed instrument of sacred origin and high celebrity amongst the *Hindus*."

On verse 558, "*Robe-neglected* is here put for *dirty clothes*. So *Laodameia* says,

' Quà possum squalore tuos imitata labores.'

' And with my squalid vesture ape thy toils.'

To gratify our readers who have sympathised with the unfortunate demigod, we shall quote the six last lines of the poem.

" This said, he ceased : the messenger of air
 Conveyed to *Alaca* his wild despair ;
 The god of wealth, relenting, learned his state,
 And swift curtailed the limit of his fate,
 Removed the curse ; restored him to his wife,
 And blest with ceaseless joy their everlasting life."

We learn that a cheaper edition of this poem has been printed in octavo, without the Sanscrit text, and that the ingenuous translator now devotes his leisure hours to the composition of a Sanscrit and English Dictionary. On this great undertaking, we congratulate the public, as general science and literature will undoubtedly be promoted by such a work ; but thousands of our readers will probably wish that Mr. Wilson had left to others the more laborious, though perhaps more useful, employment of lexicographical compilation, and still continued to transfuse the beauties of eastern poetry into English verse, a task for which he seems to be so eminently qualified.

M. Y.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM.

The word *פֶּתַח*, says Parkhurst in his Hebrew Lexicon, " is frequently used as the name of that miraculous bread from heaven,

with which Jehovah fed the Israelites in the wilderness, *Manna*. At its first falling Exod. xvi. 15. *The children of Israel*—said this (is) a particular species, a particular thing, *for they knew not what it was*; and in our English version of the Bible it is rendered—“It is manna; for they knew not what it was.” The Bishop of ELY, in his Commentary on the Historical Books of Moses, gives a very different account of it, and thinks the meaning is—“this is the gift of God, or this is it which God hath appointed us.” See Vol. I. p. 252. Why so simple a phrase as *אַתָּה* should have been thus mistaken, I cannot imagine. It appears to me to be a common interrogative, meaning,—*what is it?* and as such was understood by the LXX, who render it *τι ἐστι τοῦτο*; Parkhurst’s mistake, and indeed the mistake of almost all the modern Commentators on the subject, appears to have arisen from confounding together the pronoun, the preposition, and the substantive noun. In the sentence produced by Parkhurst, 1 Kings, xviii. 5. and translated by him *species or kind*, it is a mere preposition; in the above interrogative phrase, a pronoun, and in all the other examples from the Bible, when applied as the name of the *ἀρπάγεια*, the *manna*, or bread from heaven, it is a substantive noun, and means a *divine gift or favor*. Let us consider the circumstances which led to this name.

The Israelites murmured against the Lord and said—“Ye have brought us forth into this wilderness to kill this whole assembly with hunger; then the Lord said unto Moses, behold; I will rain bread from Heaven for you.” c. xvi. 3, 4. This, which appeared in the ground, “a small round thing, as small as the hoarfrost,” v. 14. the Israelites when they first saw, “said one to another *אַתָּה* *what is it?* for they knew not what it was.” Moses answered—“This is the bread which the Lord hath given you to eat,” v. 15. “And the House of Israel named it (in consequence) a *divine gift or favor* (דֵּבֶר)” v. 31.

The word *من* in Arabic is applied exactly in the above sense, and *مَنِانٌ* a derivative from the same root, means *munificent*, and with the article, is as an epithet of the Deity, to denote the *munificent*, the *bountiful*,—as *الْعَالِيُّ الْمَنِانُ*. *God the most high and munificent*, and hence perhaps, (as observed before in my remarks on a passage in Virgil,) the origin of the Latin *munus*, a *sacred gift or oblation*.

A. LOCKETT.

London, 28th Nov. 1815.

RICHARDI BENTLEII

Epistolae Duae

AD

TI. HEMSTERHUSIUM.

CLARISSIMO VIRO,

TIB. HEMSTERHUSIO

S. P. D.

RICHARDUS BENTLEIUS.

No. II.—*Continued from No. xxiii. p. 161.*

JAM septimana, credo, effluxit, ex quo literas tuas optatissimas per adolescentem Danum accepi, in quibus serio videris laborare, ut a negligentiæ te criminè purges, quod epistolio a me olim accepto tam sero demum rescriperis. Næ tu parum adhuc me nosti, si aut id me credis succensuisse; aut adeo irasci facilem, ut tam operosa excusatione tibi opus fuerit. Non enim tam grande premium emendatiunculis meis statuere soleo, ut singularem aliquam gratiam inde sperem, aut exigam. Facile enim et quasi sponte mihi solent subnasci: et iniquum plane est, quod minimo mihi labore constet, id postulare magis gratiæ mihi apponi. Tu tamen haud contentus exquisitissimis verbis grates mihi persolvere etiam elegantissimo Luciane libelli munere demereris me voluisti. Quin, ut magis magisque in tuo ære sim, variantes Flacci lectiones ex codice scripto polliceris, accurata tua opera describendas. Enimvero ob tam prolixam tuam humanitatem, non dici potest, quam devinctum tibi me ac obstrictum habeas. Scias autem, amice præstantissime, me ejusdem Franekeriani libri lectiones e bibliotheca Franciana entas a Præsule Eliensi dudum habuisse: quas tamen indiligerenter et perfunctorie descriptas esse satis mihi compertum est. Tu, sat scio, longe plures et fideliores inde depromeres: neque tamen, cum meliores aliquot Codices aliunde sim nactus, operæ premium fucrit te isto labore et tædio cruciari. Si ipsius Codicis (quod Anchersenius non desperare jussit) vel biduum tantummodo mihi copia fieri posset; crediderim equidem nonnihil fructus ad actionem nostram inde perventurum. Ego enim vel ex ipsis lituris multa expiscari possem, quæ alius eujusvis Animadversionum mearum inscii et oculos et mentem fugere est necesse. Tu, quod

commodo tamen tuo fiat, experieris, an ex claustris Bibliothecæ codex ille huc evolare potuerit.

Ceterum ob nitidam illam et magnificam Pollucis editionem (cujus exemplar continuo ut prodiit mihi comparavi) quas tibi gratias satis dignas referemus? Deus bone, quæ industria, quæ eruditio, quod judicium, quod acumen, quæ fides ubique eluet? Unum tibi defuisse doleo (quod a vera amicitia profectum æquis auribus accipies) majorem rei Metricæ peritiam. Cum enim cetera in Polluce sere omnia non ita magno labore expediri et restituiri possint ex aliis Lexicis; in fragmentis vero Poëtarum, quæ subinde adducuntur, recte refingendis is demum ardus sit labor et periculosus: haec qui sine rei metricæ doctrina ausit attingere, perinde est, ac si in Labyrinthum se conjecerit, sine fili præsidio exitum tentaturus. Certe qui syllabarum omnium quantitatem et omnigenorum versuum mensuram in numerato habet, ei πόριμος erunt multa et facilia, quæ aliis hac scientia destitutis prorsus sunt ἀπορα. Quare obsecro te, vir eximie, et magnopere hortor, ut et hanc eruditionis partem ceteris, quas cumulate adeo possides, velis adjungere; grande, mihi crede, operæ pretium et mirificam quandam voluptatem inde latus. Animos autem tibi addat, docimentoque sit celeberrimus noster Kusterus; qui ubi primum in Britanniam appulit Editioni Suidæ manum admoturus, Prosodia vero ultra Hexametros et Elegiacos fere imperitus, me auctore et suo amore, sedulam huic doctrinæ operam navavit. Quid autem ille eximium sit in Suida, quem emendatissimum dedit, sive in Aristophane, quem nunc in manibus habet, perficere potuisset? Nihil certe in ejusmodi fragmentis absque hac ope proferre, impone de aliorum quidem conjecturis judicare et cognoscere licet. Quamobrem, etsi paullum otii nactus dieculam hanc tibi impendere statui, et integrum Pollucis librum decimum percurrere, quem tu jure omnium difficillimum esse questus es; haud tamen mirer, si quæ ego pro certissimis habeo, tibi, ut nunc est, incerta, dubia, falsa videantur. Ea tamen postea, ubi in Metrica arte versatior fuisti, τῶν ἐπὶ Σάγρᾳ clariora tibi visum iri, haud vanus vates prænunties.

X. 11. Ridicule Kuhnius, in Prosodia plane hospes, et Iudegermanno longe inferior; Καὶ σκεύη οἰκητῆρις. Senarius ille sic legi et distingui debuit, Καὶ ναι μὲν ἡτοί, ἄλλα σκευάσῃ οἰκητήρια. Sect. 12. Menandri locum sic lege,

— ὅσ' ἔστι μαλαχὰ συλλαβών,

'Εκ τῆς πόλεως τὸ σύγλων ἐκπήδη φίλος.

Necessarius est hic iambus φίλος ex MSS. non stare potest sponsorius βάττου. *Vasa tua colligens, amice, exili ex urbe.* In Diphili loco, male factum, quod è δόμου in textu posueris pro vulgato ἐκφράμει. Sic totum refine:

— εἴτα μαλαχὸν, τὸ δύστηρ, ἔχεις
Σκευάσιον, ἐκπαγκάσιον, ἀργυρίδιον.

Οὐκ ἐκδραυτὶ λαβὼν τόσε, καὶ δώσεις ἐμοὶ¹
Ιπποκανταθήκην;

'Εχόμενοι Atticum pro ἐκδραυῇ ab ἐκδραμοῦμαι. Cetera jam facilia.
Sect. 17. Aristophanis locus sic ponendus:

— καὶ τὸν ιμίτα μου —

"Εγγονοὶ καὶ τέναφροιον —

Mud Alexidis ibidem, H. i. ē με ἄγεις διὰ τῶν κύκλων, sic rescribe,
A. Πῆ δὴ μὲ γε; B. δὶ τῶν κύκλων. Dialogus est, Qua me du-
cis? per cyclos. Recte Vulgati πη qua, non πη quo. Sequentem
autem Diphili locum credo me antea tentasse, ut conjicio ex tua
Epistola. Mea enim exemplar non servavi, neque nunc, quid
scripserim, memini. Locus autem sic constituendus videtur:

Καὶ προστὶ τίνυν ἐσχίζαν, κλίνην, κάλον,
Στρυμάτα, σίγυνον, ασκόπυχαν, βύλακον.

"Ω: που στρατιώνην ἀν τις, ἀλλὰ καὶ κύκλουν

Ἐκ τῆς ἀγορᾶς δεθά βαδίζειν ὑπολάρβοι.

Ταῦτος ἐπ' ὁ ἔπος, ἐν σὺνεργιᾳ φέρεται.

Κλίνην tu recte pro Καὶ νῦν. Epitheton enim hic locum non
habet. Pro συνὸν sine dubio reponere σίγυνον inde militi eum com-
parat. Quodsi et antea σιγυνον in Epistola emendaverim, illud in-
dicio erit, veram esse conjecturam, quā bis ex intervallo in mentem
venerit. Porro Sect. 21. locus *Antiphonis* (sic enim recte MSS. et
plura hujus et Diphili fragmenta apud Atheneum extant, que ex
huiusmodi γλωττας et affectatis vocabulis quererunt risum; nulla
Aristophanis, qui odio habebat illi φετιχὰ) ad Senarios redigendum
est, si Kuhnium audimus. Dii boni! ne vestignum quidem sena-
tum est in tribus illis, quos concinnavit, ut plane nauseam mihi mo-
veant. Tu vero tetrametros Trochaicos sic resinge et colloca:

A. Άν κελύν με σταθμούχος. B. ὁ σταθμούχος δὲ ἔστι τίς;

Αποπνίξεις σὺ δὴ με κατέν περ; με διάλεκτον λαλάν.

A. Εἰ πιτάταις μοι στέγασχις.

Binae, ut vides, sunt persona; quarum prior novo vocabulo
utitur στάθμούχος pro οἰκοδ.στότη, quod altera se negat intelligere.
Prior vero ineptire pergit; et quasi σφείστερον τι dicturus, aliud ver-
bum adhibet æque ignotum. Nam ἀν κελεύ με σταθμούχος, et (ex
nostra Emendatione) εἰ πιτάταις μοι στέγασχις, idem significant.
Sect. 39. Locus Aristophanis, τι μὲ πάντην ἐξαρίζεις ὥσπερ κλιτέριον,
mendosus est sine dubio. Sed corrigiendi viam certam non possum
inire; quia τὸ μέτρον hic non agnosco. Sect. 35. legerim, ex Scirone
Satyrico:

Σχέδου χαμενήτ σύμμετρος Κορινθίας.

Παρδός, κανθάρου δὲ οὐχ ὀπερτεύει πόδα.

σθραμβός εἰ τῇ χαμενῇ non procerior es lectulo Corinthiae cyparis
enīlla. Sed haec aptius conveniunt Procrustæ (scis historiam)
quam Scironi; adeo ut forte in eadem fabula de utroque poenas
sumserit Theseus. Sect. 39. Aristophanis δὲ θεαταῖς, Τὸν χειρῶν

ἴγνα μι, εστι. Nulla hic sententia, nullum metrum. Nimirū sunt verba Pollucis, (non Comici) et sic corrigenda: Ἐν δ οὐναῖσιν τὰ χρηῶν πτερά μυθοὶ εστι. In Danaism μι, διανερούμηνην πληναμ significat. Atque hoc verum est. Ibid. apage illud Hyperidis ὑπερ νίκη; quod temere in textum recepisti ex insulsa conjectura Kuhnii. Quis dubitet post ὑπέρ sequi virti nemini; ut in reliquis Hyperidis terque quaterque apud Harpocritionem. Ergo Μι, οὐνα πρό μήκας οὐ enim αὐτούς εἰς περιπέτειαν facile absorberi potuit. Sect. 41. Πονηταί etc. Placet vulgatum αὐτοῖς; et sic constitue,

Πονηταί τὸ δέσμου τοι, θηροῦ—
φρεψας οὐ να

Σόξαι κνεζέλων.

Jam in illo Chionidae Sect. 43, Πολλοῖς διγνάδης ἀκοίω κατά σενενιας quod in metri legem gravissime peccat, besti quod corrupta illa Falkenburgiani codicis ἔγνα διχρόνη et οὐνα non invidisti nobis: Ecce enim ex illis ruderibus veram tibi lectionem praesto:

Πλαστὸν ἔγναδη, κού κατά σε, ξενία

Φρεψαροῦντας ἀγάχνους, νάν ταμακι κι μαμένους.

Nor i, inquit, multos adolescentes, atque eos non tuas sortis, vel, non tui similes, excubantes sine lucerna, et super arundinem domum cunctes. Αγάχνος eodem sensu Euripidi dictum apud nostrum VII. 178.

Κοίλας ἐν ἀντροῖς ἀλυχνες ωσπερ θηρι, μύνο.

Sect. 46. in illo Antiphatis pro νον χλατοι, vel, ut Aldi editio, οὐ χαλκοι ευρι εxtat in IV. 183. εἰς απότυπον. Et sane cum παρα adverbium hic convenit: lege

— κατεσκι μαρνενος

Ιαν-οντατον ιατσειν ουχιχω. πάνυο

Ιεντηρισιν, έξαλπτροι, αντ. οι. ον,

Σικάνισιν, ιπαθιτοσιν—

Sect. 55. Stratidis versus sic in ordinem redigendi sunt; non ut Kuhnus dedit absurdissime; ut confidentiam quidem hominis mirer, qui id ausus sit profiteri, quod nec hilum intelligebat,

πρό-της ἄγε

Τοις πάλοις ἀτέρεμα, προσταξίν την ἀγωγέα*

Βραχύτερον οὐχ ὅγει, δ'- Υβρις εὐθύ φτι;

Πρόθες ἄγε, produc equum placide: ετι quoque necessarium et sententiaz et versui, ab eo absortum est Sect. 58. Locum Philyllii, in quo solemniter delirat Kuhnus, sic restitue. Ηκι πινακίδης οὐ της εύροις ἐν ταῖς Φιλυλλοῦ Πόρετι, λαγοὶ γέ τοι λαγίζων,

Ἐκ τῆς πινακίδος; άν περέως, οτι καν λαγοί

Τα γραμματ, έργηνον.

Πινακίδα, inquit, inveniatur in Philyllii Πόλεσσα dicit φαλατορις, Interpretare tu clare ex fabula, quid literae significantur. Vide, opinor, Dorismum εκ ταῖς ετημηγέται. (αφανεις, idem quid διανοεσθαι. vide Hesych.) Nimirū persona hic inducitur vernacula lingua utens Dorica; unde Πόλεις credo nostrarum dramati institutum: quod variarum urbium cives quaque dialecto ibi loquebantur. Sect.

62. Antiphonis locus est: ubi ξυνακόλουθος a versu repudiatur. Eleganter et vere Salmasius Ἀξυνακόλουθος, Ἑγρῆς, αὐτολήχυθος. i. e. *incomitatus*, quod *onunino* in textum recipiendum erat. Poteris etiam sic refingere,

Ευνηκολούθεις Ἑγρῆς, αὐτολήχυθος.

Sed alterum illud sententiae videtur aptius. Sect. 63. Optime dedit locum Eupolidis Jungermannus, ex necessitate metri,

"Οστις πύλην ἥκεις ἔχων καὶ χαλκίν,
"Ισπερ λεχώ στρατιάτις ἐξ Ἰανίας.

Clara sententia, *Qui urnam et alenam portas: tanquam puerpera Ionica, castra sequens.* Nempe in Ionia, ubi disciplina militaris non admodum vigebat, mos erat, ut uxores comitarentur suos maritos militantes: ubi si quæ forte peperisset, vasa circumferebat balneatoria. At bonus vir, Kuhnus, στρατιώτης hic in senario ponit: quod perinde est, ac si sic in Virgilio legendum contenderet, *Tityre tu pratulae recumbens sub tegmine fagi.* Vides, opinor, ὡς εἰδη κεφαλὴ, quantivis esse pretii leges metricas rite callere. Sect. 64. Locus Hesychii, *Λίνα δὲ οἰστα;* καὶ ὀμολίνου μαχροτόνοι. Sine dubio senarius erat, sed līna stare hic non potest, cum posteriore corripiat; at λινᾶ a λινοῦς optime: tum autem requiretur substantivum plurale. Lege igitur, si libet,

.λινᾶ δὲ γείσα, χώμολίνυ μαχροὶ τόνοι.

Hesychius in Γείσα, ἔνοι δὲ, inquit, τὰς ὡς τοῦ ἐνόματος γείσα λέγουσιν, ita ibi legendum, non γείσα. Lineis, inquit, simbris, et crudis lini tenias. Sed, cum Editio Aldina habeat λινας πίσσα, et Codd. MSS. λίνα δὲ σπίστα; merito illud sigma haud temere irrepsisse videatur. Verius igitur, credo, reponas,

λίνα δὲ σπίστα, χώμολίνυ μαχροὶ τόνοι.

Sect. 65. Antiphonis locus, καὶ τὸ χερνίβιον πρῶτον ἡ πομπὴ σαφῆς, ut senarium clare se ostendit fuisse, ita et sic esse corrigendum, Τὸ χερνίβιον non χερνίβιον. Lego equidem totum ex Falkenb. Τὸ χερνίβιον πρῶτον ἡ πομπὴ ἄφεις, vel ἀφεῖς. Sed, excepto χερνίβιον, nihil hic certum. Jam vero sect. 71. in Epicharmi senario ferri non potest δηλοίμην; requiritur vi metri vel δηλοῖ μὲν, vel δηλοῖμεν, vel fortasse,

Οὐτ' ἐν κάθῳ δηλῶμεν, οὔτ' ἐν ἀμφορεῖ.
λῶμεν, volumus, ut λῆσ, ωισ, λῶντι, νοἱεντ, Δωρικῶς. Sect. 73. sic constitue locum Antiphonis:

—άσκοποτηνην τινα—

Αἴψους ἀρωγόν—

Sect. 74. Aristophanes ἐν δὲ τῷ Γῆρᾳ, "Ἐφ' οὐρίαν δαιεῖσιν πεντέχουν ἡ μείζονα. Atqui senarius haud recte procedit: quod ut fiat, *lege minima mutatione*, "Ἐν δὲ τῷ Γῆρᾳ ἰφη,

Τερπλαν δαιεῖσιν πεντέχουν ἡ μείζονα.

plane, ut hinc Sect. 76. *Kρατίνος* δὲ "Πραις, "Ἐφ' ιμῶν, pro ἐν "Πραις ἰφη, Μῶν διτα. Ceterum corruptior est Polyzeli locus sect. 76. sed metri vestigia insistens sic veram lectionem eruo:

—λεκανίω γ' ἄρα
Πρῶτου μὲν ἀπογένεσις, ἔπειτ' ἐνεξέμεσις,
'Ευεκτλυνεῖς, ἐναποτατήσεις, Φανία.

Primum, ait, in λεκανίω lavabis adhuc puro; postea ad spurciora eo abuteris. Vide autem, ut una cum metro ~~sententia~~ quoque belle procedat. Quis neget, ἔπειτα necessarium esse post πρῶτον? quis in ἐναποβισεις, quod nihil est, non agnoscit τὸ ἐναποβατήσοις? Denique pro Κουκλο nominie inaudito, ecce tibi de machina trisyllabon ~~Φαντασίας~~, Persona apud Menandrum et alios comicos notissima. Ceterum nota illud, ἐνεξέμεσις, quod futurum notat Ἀττικῆς, ut plura alia ~~tibi~~ sine dubio non incognita. At sequitur deploratus plane locus Aristophanis, Καὶ ημασκάρης ὁ ὡς ἐν τι εἰποδίλονιων ἐμουμανεῖν ex quibus depravissimis, tu nobis, amice, horribilem versum effinxisti, plane ἀμετρον et ἀμονσον. At dehinc, sime audis, et artē metricam assequeris, id saltem disces quod quantivis est pretii, tacere potius, quam nihil dicere. Ego vero ex prima facie catalecticum tetrametrum hic agnosco; ut proinde aut talis versus hinc excudendus sit, aut omnis opera ludatur. Vis ergo, ut hariolari incipiāt? age, aut veram lectionem tibi dabo, aut saltem Aristophane non indignam; lege igitur,

*Κάμην σκάφην δέ, ὥστε μὴ 'σ ποδάνιπτρον ἐξεμάμενον
Et nobis scapham da, ne evomamus in aquam qua pedes ablueri
sunt.*

Possit et sic, *Κάμην σκάφης δέ, μήποτ' εἰς &c.*

Sed hoc, ut dixi, est hariolari: nam et animadverto te aliter paullo in Editione, aliter in Epistola ad me scripta, codicis verba exhibere. Si ipsa Excerpta Falkenburgiana viderem, certius fortasse aliquid extunderem. Sect. 78. in Dioclis senario nescivit bonus Kuhnus ποδάνιπτρη secundam syllabam corripere; lege autem;

Τούγια τις, ἡ χαλκοῦς ποδανίπτηρ, ἡ λέβης.

Quin et Jungermannus (etsi altero, ut dixi, longe melior) sect. 79. in Pherecratis loco senarium inchoat ab *Εἰσέχρουσεν*; plane contra artem. Tu vero Tetrametrum puta, et sic constitue,

Αχθούσα μὲν τοις χρυνίκος, τὸν πύνθαν εἰσέχρουσεν.

Sect. 82. in Cratini loco, nolle cæcum ducem secutus essem Kuhnium, in κατ' ἄλφιτα. Quam otiosum enim ibi τὰ στίχα? quam necessarius articulus τὰ ἄλφιτα, ut ὁ βοῦς, ἡ μαγίς? Ergo sanitissima est vetus lectio:

Ο βοῦς ἔκεινος, χ' ἡ μαγίς, καὶ τὰλφιτα.

Porro Phrynichi locus sect. 86. Καν δένθαφω &c. est *Anapæsticus Aristophaneus*; sed deficit uno pede anapæsto:

Kαν δένθαφω χρίσθω—τρεῖς χοινίκας ἢ δύο ἀλεύρων.
neque vero sine Codice suppleri debet ex conjectura, lege insuper paullo ante, ἐν "Ορνιτῃ" Aristophanous, non νης; ut huc in τοῖς Φρυνίχου Μούσαις. Eodem versus genere habetur Metagenis locus sect. 88. sic collocandus:

—ως ἀν

Πολλαῖς παραψίσι καὶ καιναῖς εὐωχήσω τὸ φίατρον.
ut et alter iste ex Aristophanis Tagenistis,

Tὸ δὲ ἔτνους ἐν ταῖς κυλίχναις τοῦτο θερμὸν, καὶ τοῦτο παριάζειν.

Metrum ipsum efflagitat ἔτνους et τοῦτο, non ἔτνος et τοῦτο quod ultimam producit. Eleganter vero ἔτνους casu genitivo. ἔτνους τοῦτο καὶ τοῦτο. *Pultis pars calida, pars bulliens.* Sect. 90. in Cratetis loco, nolle te a scriptura Codicis discessisse,

'Ο κάνης δὲ τῆς κοίτης ὑπερέχειν μοι δοκεῖ.

Nam τὰ κανίσκια δὲ &c. quod tu dediti, peccat in leges metri. Totus locus sic videtur legendus; 'Ἐπὶ δὲ τούτοις καὶ κανὰ καὶ κάνητα καὶ κανίσκια. Καὶ κάνης μὲν Κράτης ἐν "Ηρωιν εἰπεν, 'Ο κάνης δὲ τῆς κοίτης ὑπερέχειν μοι δοκεῖ (ubi κάνης videtur esse storea, teges) κάνητες vero Aristoph. Acharn. κανίσκια in Gerytade. vel forte κανίσκια reji-ciendum, et κανίτια recipiendum ex VI. 86. Sect. 91. Eupolidis versus Trochaicus est, sic describendus:

'Αλλὰ τὰς κοίτας γ' ἔχεισα πλωτιώς σταγαρένας.

Sed Pherecratis locum tangere non ausim, adeo deformis est; si modo recte illum ex MS. exscripsi. 'Αλλὰ καὶ κοίτας τὰς ἐν ἐμῷ ἀπόβατος ἀμέλομεν ἀριστήσειν. Sed ex fine tamen subodoror esse Aristophancum σκονδεῖσθαι. Tentemus igitur ad illud metrum redigere, 'Αλλ' ἐν κοίταις ἐν γ', οὔτ' ἀπόβατος, ἀ·λλοι· ἀριστήσειν. Sed in arcis insunt, non spernenda quidem, quae cramus pransuri. 'Eni id est ἔνεστι ἀ·μέλομεν contracte ἀ·μ. ut syllaba fiat longa, quam versus exigit. Sect. 93. Nicocharis verba duos senarios efficere pronunciat Kuhnus, qui ex numero syllabarum, non quantitate, senarios metiri videtur: melius paullo Jungermannus. Tu sic lege:

Σόφαις τε (vel Σοφαῖς παλ.) παλάμαις τεκτάναι εἰγχασμένον

Καὶ πόλλ' ἐν αὐτῷ λέπτ' ἔχων καδίσκια, Κυριακόκις—

vel etiam τέκτονος ἀπειγατμένην. Sect. 94. in Anaxippi loco apage illud στάθητι, quod versus respuit. lege, Τὴν μυιστίην λαβὼν παραστῆθεντες. et ibidem Aristophanis locum sic dederat Pollux,

Φέρε τοὺς ὁβελίσκους οὐ ἀναπήξω τὰς κίχλας.

Varia lectio ἀναπήξω, ἀναπέιρω atque haec melior. Sect. 98. in Teleclidis loco emendatio tua σίκοντα melius se tutabitur, si sic legeris:

Tὸ δὲ τηγάνω σίκοντα τοι μολύνεται.

quod sine dubio verum. Quot enim τήγανα una σίκον? adde quod τήγανον non potest μολύνεσθαι, corrumpi, dum σίκει; sed postquam destitit σίκει humore consumto, tum corruptitur, nisi ocius de foco tollitur. Denique ὅντα ἐν τηγάνῳ σίκουσιν, οὐκ αὐτὸν τὸ τηγάνον. Aristophanes quidem loco a te laudato τάγηνον τριβῶν σίκον dixit συνεδροχόντα: sed simpliciter τάγηνον σίκον sine illo τευθίδιν vix, opinor, dixisset. Sect. 101. locus Pherecratis sic locandus et corrigendum.

— πᾶς ἀν οὐν κομίσειέ μοι

Tις θυμαλώπων ὡδε μεστὴν ἐσχάραν;

Sect. 102. Menandri locum sic scribe:

— ἡγεῖται μ' ὅλως

Ἐπικόπανόν τι —

Me quidem plane mensam coquinariam quandam existimat.

(adeo me verberibus concidit) Sect. 103. Solonis jambum dolet mihi a te jugulatum esse, cum tuo πευσίδ. Quid nonne ex illis οἱ μὲν satis constat, nullum vas anteivisse: οἱ μὲν enim semper inchoat: sed ipse versus illud tuum furcilla expellit. Scribendum, aut σπεῦδουσι δ', aut διδοῦσι δ', aut simile quid trisyllabon. Sect. 105. locus Cratini, Ἐπέδωκεν βαλάνων ἀβακα τῶν ἐκ φιττέως, ubi Kuhnus corrigit Πιτθέως, scil. ex domo Pitthei. Frustra; quasi Pittheus Thesei avunculus in vivis esset aestate Cratini; Ceterum quis non videt locum quandam, ubi βάλανοι nascuntur, non hominem designari? Evidem sic légerim,

Ἐπέδωκε βαλάνων ἀβακα τῶν ἐκ Φελλέως.

Φελλεὺς locus Attice notissimus, de quo vide Stephanum Byzantium, Suidam, alios. Aristophanes in Nubibus, "Οταν μὲν οὖν τὰς αἰγας ἐκ τοῦ Φελλέως. et in Acharn. Τὴν Στρυμόδωρου Θράτταν ἐκ τοῦ Φελλέως. Vide ibi σχολ. Sect. 107. in loco Eubuli, pro Σικελικῇ, quod χαρτεύει est, lege,

Καὶ πνικτὰ Σικελιὰ πατανίων σωρεύματα.

et ibidem Antiphanus, tam hic, quam apud Athenaeum, lege,

τηναλύπτινος τετμημένος; non πολύπτινος.

Sect. 110. locus Sophoclis mendorosus est; qui hinc et ex VII. 109. sic corrigendus:

— συνέλεγον τὰ ξύλ', ὡς ἐκκαυμάτων

Μή μοι μεταξὺ προσδεῖς εἴεν —

ligna, ait, collegernunt; ne interea carerent fomite ad ignem servandam. Sect. 111. Euripidis versus Trochaicus est; nisi quod οἰστιν e loco suo ejjectum sit: lege, Τοὺς ὄνους τὰς λαρχαγωγοὺς ἐξ ὄρεως οἰστιν ξύλα &c. vel forte, ut sententia continuetur, λαρχαγωγοὺς, οἰστιν ἐξ ὄρους ξύλα &c.

Sect. 116. Aristophanis locus sic distinguendus,

Καὶ διαστίλβονθ' ὄρῶμεν

"Ωσπερ ἐν καινῷ λυχνούχῳ

Πάντα τῆς ἔξωμιδος.

Plura hujus generis extant apud Aristophanem. Sect. 124. Theopompi locus sic locandus,

— χλαῖνχυ δέ σοι

Λαβῶν ταχεῖαν ἐπιβαλῶ λακωνικήν.

Ibid. locus Sapphus egregius, frusta a magnis viris tentatus; quem nisi Prosodizē ductū nemo recte expediverit: 'Ελθόντ' εἶ δρανῶ πορφυρέαν ἔχοντα προιεμένον χλαῖνχυ. Ego vero, quatuor primis voca-

bulis vix perfectis, statim odoratus sum, carmen esse Alcaicum,
quale hoc Horatii;

*Nullam | Vare sacra | vite prius | severis | arborem : et illud
Alcæi,*

*Μηδὲν | ἀλλο φυτεύ | σὺς πρότερον | δένδρον | ἀμπέλω.
et aliquot Sapphus, ut quod extat apud Athenæum p. 564, ubi
οστοῖς male pro ὅστι,*

*Στᾶδι | κάντι φίλος | καὶ τὴν ἐπ' ὅστι | ἀμπέλα | σὺν χάριν,
et apud Stobæum, Κατὰ | νοῖσα δὲ κεῖστ | οὐδεπόκα | μναμοσύ | να
σέθεν, et quæ ibi sequuntur. Ergo certus conjecturæ sic exemplo
hunc locum refingebam;*

'Ιλλόντ | ἐξ ὁρανῶ | πορφυρέαν | περβέμεια | νον χλάμυν.

*Venientem de cælo, purpurea chlamyde amictum. Nam pro
προιέμενον quod et versus et sententia refugit, repono περβέμενον
Αἰολικοῦ περιέμενον sic apud Hesychium, Ἡρρεθῆκατο, περιεθῆκατο,
et alia alibi plura. Quis vero tam cœcus, ut jam non videat
τὸ ἔχοντα ex margine fluxisse, interpretamentum scil. τοῦ περβέ-
μενον.*

Verba Diphili sect. 137. sic ordinanda sunt :

A. ————— δὲ κανδύταλις

Οὐτος τι δύναται, καὶ τι ἔστιν; B. ἀσπερ ἀν-

Εἴποις ἀστράς —————

Dux personæ, quarum altera quererit, quid significet κανδύταλις; altera explicat per ἀστράς. Multa similia hujus Diphili extant apud Athenæum : videtur fuisse φορτικὸς in verborum exoticorum affectatione. Sect. 139. Posidippi locum ita digere :

———— σκήνας, ὄχην,

Πίσκους, ἀστράς, τάχα δὲ, λαμπήνας, ὄνους.

nam τάχαν nihil est; neque inclusus quid nunc succurrit.

Sect. 141. Nicochares in Cretensibus : καὶ ὄπεας καὶ ὄπύτιον
εἴησται ἐν Νικοχάρους Κρησὶ, τοῖς τρυπάνοις ἀντίταλον ἀσπερ Ἀρχιλό-
χειον. Ita tu, mi amice, locum depravatum ulterius contaminasti :
πλευρενī dedisti pro ἀσπερ Seberi : atqui illud mendum erat typothetarum : voluit enim Seberus quod et Aldus et MSti habent ὄπερ. Deinde pro Ἀρχιλόχειον, Codices ἀρχιλίον. Ex hoc monstro, re metrica et ingenio fretus, sic tibi senarium restituo verum et genuinum,

Toῖς τρυπάνοις ἀντίταλον ὄπεας χεῖλιον.

Quippe in hoc versu aut ὄπύτιον aut ὄπεας inesse debere res ipsa clamitat : aliqui prius a versu rejicuntur, posterius latuit in ὄπεαν. Ergo in reliquis ne litera quidem mutata, et versus et sententia constat. *"Οὐτας χίλιοι idem est ac ὄπεατα χίλια ; ut ἵππος χιλίη, μυρίη,
et quæ scio tibi nota esse. Verte autem Mille subulæ quæ terebris
paria faciat possint. Videtur fuisse dialogus fabri cum cerdone ; illi minabatur de τοῖς τρυπάνοις factum esse nescio quid : hic regere-*

bat, se mille ὄπέτα adlaturum, quæ illius τρυπάνοις pares esse facile possent. Sect. 142. Platonis versus sic digere et scribe,

— βούλει τήνδε σοι πλεκτὴν καθῆ,

Κάπειτ' ἀνελκύσω σε δένρῳ —

Sect. 143. Menandri versus Trochaicus est, "Ω; ἔγωγ' ἀνειλόμην
που σκυνίω πετληγμένος.

Jam vero insignem Euripidis locum sect. 145. sanum, ni fallor,
tibi exhibebo :

— πᾶς δὲ φασγάνω?

Ἐντιέριζεν μάτε πύρινον στάχυν,

Σπάθῃ κυλούσων φασγάνου μελανόστου.

Nihil hic muto, nisi quod στάχυν addiderim, absorptum scilicet a sequente voce στάχη. Sententiam recte cepit Jungermannus. πύρινον στάχυς, spica triticea, ἐξαθρίζω hic est ἀσπας, aristas, detruncō, decutio. Quid clarius certiusve?

Sect. 150. Epistola ad Platonem in mendo cubat: *Oi περὶ Ἐραστοῦ καὶ Κόρισκον Πλάτωνος ἐπιστέλλοντες γνάφουσι. Αηνὸν Ἀστίαν τῆς Σαρκοφάγου λίθῳ. Οἱ δὲ φερεχάπτη. Verba illa, Αην. Ασ. τ. Σαρ. λ. sunt ex Epistola; reliqua sunt Pollucis. Dixerat ille inter σοροποιῶν instrumenta esse et ληγὸν probat jam hujus Epistolæ auctoritate. Quippe qui ληγὸν Αστίαν nominaverant, de eadem re postea ibi narrantes σαγὸν appellant. Ergo eadem ληγὸς quæ σορός. Ceterum ἐπάγει et ἐπάγουσι sæpe hoc sensu veniunt apud nostrum; vide modo sect. 10. 41. 127. Porro in sequente Pherecratis loco sect.*

150. ita ordinandi sunt versus et Personæ:

*II μὴν οὐ σαντὸν μακαριῖς, ὁ τὰν, ὅταν
Αἴσιοι σε καταρύπτωτιν. Β. οὐ δῆτ', ἀλλ' ἐγώ
Τούτους χρέτερον οὐτοι δὲ μακαριώσι σφε
Καὶ τοι ποίεν ληγοὺς τοσαῖτας λήψουσι;*

A. Certe te beatum ipse dices, o amice, cum illi te sepeliant. B. non quidem, verum ipse eos prius sepeliam; et illi se beatos prædicabunt: *Unde tamen tot loculos eis sepeliendis comparabo?* Ω τὰν autem addidi, flagitante versu; quod absorptum est a verbo sequente, μακαριοῦσι σφε, brabunt se ipsi. Cur autem aut hic aut illi μακαριοῦσι se, cum sepeliuntur? nempe ob funus egregie factum, et sepulcrum magno sumtu extructum. Loquitur autem aliquis, qui multos cognatos habuerit, bonis ejus inhiantes, et mortem ejus expectantes: quos ille se occupaturum minatur, et fore illis superstitem. Immo vero, jam melius quid habeo, quod sub calamo modo nascitur. Deleas velim illud σφε, et cum vulgaris legas, οὗτοι δὲ μακαριώστεροι εἰμι. Sententia autem haec videtur. Cum laudasset illa *hετοίος* quis fortunas suas, tum ob alia, tum ob firmam, credo, *valetudinem*, etsi strenue nepotaretur; Hunc alter excipiens, Ita vero, ait *εἰρωνικῶς*, tum fortunas tuas laudabis, cum cognati tui te mox sepelient. Non, non, subjungit

ille, Evidem eos omnes componam, et μακαριοῦσί με superstitem et sanum. Sect. 151. locum ex Tagenistis sic colloca;

— ὁ δὲ λόγων κύρτιν ὕσιαν

Κάτ' ἐξαιρῶν τὸν διαγώνιον. —

Sunt membra versus Anapæstici, Aristophanei dicti. Cum Kuhnii versiculum hic lego, vix possum nauicam compescere. Neque eo melior est Jungermanni jambus sect. 154. in Lysippi Bacchis. Tu vero locum sic constitue, ut membrum sit Anapæstici Aristophanei,

— αὐτοῖς αὐλοῖς ὅρμῃ καὶ γλωττοχομείῳ.

Tibicen, inquit, *ἱρυῖται* *cum tibiis et glottocomio*. Αὐτοῖς eo sensu passim apud Atticos occurrit, pro τὸν αὐτοῖς; quod tu optime nosti. Ibid. Metri ratio satis indicat, tam in Timoclis loco, quam Apollodori γλωττόχομον legendum esse, non γλωττοχομείου. Lege itaque, οὐ μὲν ἀλλα καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἴγγειου γλωττόχομον, &c. et deinde membrum pone senarii—καὶ τὸ γλωττόχομον βαλεινέται. Porro sect. 160. sanus erat Sophoclis locus, neque sollicitandus,

Κέστρῳ σιδηρῷ πλαυφῇ καὶ κατὰ ξύχιν

Πλαυνν· παιών —

*Agitabat præ se hominem, verberans super latera et dorsum
κίστρῳ σείρα.* Eleganter illud πλαυρῷ καὶ κατὰ ξύχιν, hoc est, καὶ πλευρᾷ καὶ ψυχῷ; quale illud *Anacreontis*, **Η Ν ἵλεν ἡ πὶ^τ Μέμψιν.* Ceterum κατὰ hic ultimam producit ob τὸ γ sequens.

Sect. 162. Dolet, te repūtasse emendationem certissimam,

καὶ τὴν κοινὴν ἔχ-ιν με κυρβάσιαν ἔργον.

Pileum autem dices me instar tiarae habere; adeo magnificus est scilicet. Quid aptius vel desiderari possit? et illud tuum κοινὴν quorsum spectat? *dices me habere communem tiaram:* nimirum, non esse regem. *Tί: ὁ νοοῦ:* dubiumne id esse potuit? Sed ex metro solo unique constat, legendum esse κυνηγὸν cuius argumenti vim et παθανάγκην soli artis periti possunt agnoscere. Sect. 174. locus Teleclidæ

Δουλοπόντηγον ῥυτηρὸν σκέλινθρον.

est Anapæsticus, et bene habet. Mox sect. 165. legendum,

Σκάλην γάρ ὄγχεις βασιλές ἐκτίμησον ἔμοις.

σκάλην βασιλές. *culler regis.* *Βασιλές* adjective hic ponitur, ut alia similia passim. Eunuchus autem loquitur hoc, significans, se jussu regis castratum esse, ut a cubiculo esset vel ei vel uxori: solæ enim, ut ille ait, Eunuchis utebantur reginæ. Citius autem cœlum ipsum dirueris, quam illud φατιδεῖς, cui tu patrocinaris, invito metro hic possit consistere; ut de sententia ipsa et constructione nihil dicam. Illud quoque corrigendum ibidem in *Hermippi loco*, οὐ τιδεῖ ν, non ἀσ θιον,

**Εγχιτες Ισον ἀσπιδεῖον δυκινον.* est enim senarius.

Sectione autem 167. in Philippidae loco, vel cum Salmasio legendum,

Αλύσιον είχε τέτταρας δραχμὰς ἄγον,
quod verum puto, vel, si illud quovis pacto retinere vis, lege,
Αλύσιον είχε τέτταράκοντ' ἄγον δραχμάς.

Sect. 176. Όλκειον rectum esse, non ολκιον, Menandri locus ostendit, sic digerendus;

— ἡ χαλκοῦ μέγα Όλκειον —
et alter Philemonis, Όλκειον εἴδον ἐπὶ τραπέῃ κείμενον,
• Ημέραν τε μετόπου —

Vapulet vero Kuhnii cum versiculis suis, quibus nec caput, nec pes adest. Sect. 180, locus Aristophanis duos continet Anapæsticos cum Parœmiaco eos claudente; ut fieri solet tum apud illum scriptorem, tum omnes Tragicos,

Καὶ τὸς μὲν οφεις, οὓς ἐπιπέμπεις,
Ἐν κλοτῷ που καταζήμηνται
Καὶ πάνταις φαρυκτοπωλῶν.

Porro Cappanei hæc verba esse conjicio, qui in Dramate hoc Satyrico Amphiarorum augurem ludificatur. Sect. 181. Theopompi iocum sic constitue, ex lege metri, ut antea l. vii.

Τῆνοι περιζωσάμενος ὥσπερ λοντρίδα,
Κατάθεσμον ἡβῆς περιπέτεσιν —
et mox ibidem Pherecratis locum sic emenda,

"Ηδη μὲν ὥσπερ λοντρίνων προξύννετε.

Scis sine dubio, αι et ε in libris scriptis passim inter se permuntari. Jam, ait, vos illi lavanti pelletem circumligate. Sectione autem 185. quicquid obtendant Pollucis tui codices, uti et Suidæ et Harpocratioris, legendum credo πλίνθιον, non πλίνθινον, ex fragmendo illo Aristophanis, quod membrum est Tetrametri Catalepticis,

— οὐκ εἰς τὸ πλίνθιον γενόμενος εἶτε! — Ille vero, ubi venerat ad locum quo latentes siebant, divertebat.

Quippe apud Atticos loca rerum venalium et res ipsæ venales eodem nomine signabantur, ipso Polluce indicante lib. ix. et x. Sic dicebant, εἰς τὸν φόνον, εἰς τὰ μύρα, εἰς τὸν χλωρὸν τύρον, εἰς τὰ ἀνόραπτά, εἰς τὸν σίνον, εἰς τεῖλασιν, εἰς τὰς χύτρας, εἰς τὸν λιθαντόν, &c. Ergo εἰς τὸ πλίνθιον eodem modo, ad locum ubi πλίνθινa siebat, vel venibat. Nisi forte εἰς τὰ πλίνθινa potius dicendum fuisse contendat aliquis. Ille vero sic locum constituat, eodem versus genere,

Οὐδὲ εἰς τὸ πλίνθειον γενόμενος εἴετε! —

Sect. 188. Recte habet codex Vossianus τὴν γοῦν in Aristophanis loco, qui sic digerendus:

— τὴν γοῦν ἀσπίδα,
Ἐπίθημα τῷ φρέατι παράθεις εὐθεώς.
τὰ ερέατι secundam producit.

Sect. 189. Legere possis, μὴ λίγος καλεῖται, πυνquid νοσσατος λίγος; videtur enim dubitare; unde addit, θεον καὶ Φοροκλῆς ἔφη; cuius locus sic videtur legendus,

Ασπὶς μὲν, η μοι, λίγος ὁς, πυκνομματεῖ.

Sane mitifice arridet Kuhnii illa *correcțio πυκνοματισμ*. Πατεῖ
quid hic faciat, non intelligo. Sect. 190. *Platonis Comici locum*
sic divide, — δότω δὲ τὴν κιδάραν τις ἐνθέτειν

Kαὶ τούπιπόσπαρ' —

Ibid. Anaxilæ locus sic legendus, Οὐκ ἀν γε μὴ τοιτὶ γένηται
καράμινον. Denique loco ultimo sect. 192. pro inficetis illis *senariis*
Kuhnii, quos Eupolidi de suo donat, hos ille habeat aliquanto
meliores, — καρδόνω δέο,

*Κρατῆγας ὀκτώ, δύο χύτρα, δύο τρυβλίω,
Κνέφαλα τε καὶ (vel Κνέφαλα τρία) θέρμανστριν,
ἕξ θρόνων,*
Κλίνας ἵκατὸν, κίρρης, κιβωτὸν, λύχνου.

Pro *χύτρων* versu tertio, quod iam præcesserat, neque repeti
debuit, repones σχάφην, vel λύραν, vel simile quid, quod proprius
accedit. Nobis ad indagandum fugitivum illud nunc non est
otium. Defessus enim sum rædio scribendi; quod longe majore
opera mihi constitit, quam emendationes ipsæ. Tu vero, docti-
sime et amicissime Hemsterhusi, si quid hinc frugis colligere pos-
sis ad curas tuas secundas, quas in Polluce te positurum narras,
utere, fruere, jure tuo et arbitratu. Ubi id tempus venerit, vide-
bimus forte, an in ceteris hujus libris aliquid nobis occurrat, quod
doctissimos editores fugerit. Etsi, ut verum fatear, rationem con-
sillii tui nondum perspicio. Quis enim typographus librum denuo
recudet, mole sua et pretio laborantem? Ecquando omnia nu-
peræ Editionis exemplaria dividentur? Tu igitur certiores nos
facies, quo pacto et quo instituto iterum, ut narras, auctorem
hunc aggredi velis. Vale, vir eruditissime, et me, quod facis,
amare perge. Cantabrigiæ, ix. die Junii, MDCCVIII.

ADVERSARIA LITERARIA.

NO. VIII.

Explicit. This word, generally used at the end of MSS. and
early printed books, is a contraction of *explicitus*. The ancient
books were rolls of parchment, (hence the Latin word *volumen*,
and our *volume*) which were unfolded by the reader in his progress
through them. When they were quite *unfolded*, they were of course
finished; and the word *explicitus*, which properly conveyed the
former sense, was afterwards used in the latter, when the books
assumed a different form, to signify that they were *finished*.

A. L.

Points.—Fabretti, in his collection of ancient Inscriptions, published at Rome in 1699, observes that “the ancients placed Points at the end of every word, but scarcely ever at the end of a line, though sometimes after every syllable.”—This is exemplified in A.D. FINIBUS. OB. VENERIT. DUM. TAXAT. This singular mode was used in the third century.

It has been said that these Points were placed in Epitaphs, in order to excite sympathy and grief in the mind of the reader by these frequent pauses. But we find in Lupi (*Epitaphium Severa*) the following Inscription, which is full of Points, without any sentiment of pity or sorrow:

IMP. CAES. M. AN. TO. NI. O.
COR. DI. A. NO. PI. O. PE. LI. CI.
AVG. P. M. TRIB. POT. II. COS. PP.
COR. NE. LI. A. PRÆ. TEX. TA. TA.
IVI. NAM. PI. E. TA. TEM. E. IVS.
QVE. SVOS. ET
DI. CI. VM.
EN. TI. AM. SV. AM.
BA. VIT.

The title DAN is derived from *Dominus*; which in the monkish ages was written *Domnus*, and afterwards abbreviated by the French into *Dom*, by the Spaniards into *Don*, and by the English into *Dan*.

A. L.

None of the commentators on Shakespeare, or general critics, have noticed a line in Hamlet, the harsh, difficult sound of which admirably expresses the sense:

And in this harsh world draw thy breath in pain.

Vaugelas took such infinite pains with his translation of Quintus Curtius, and delayed the publication of it so long by his frequent corrections, that Voiture told him that before his work was complete, the French language would have undergone changes, which would oblige him to recompose it. By the substitution of *lingua* to *barba*, he applied to him the verses of Martial:

Eutrapelus tonsor, dum circuit ora Luperci,
Exponitque genas, altera barba subit.

The translation at last appeared, and no higher character can be given of it than the expression of Balzac, that the Alexander of Quintus Curtius was invincible, and that of Vaugelas inimitable.

AFRICAN LANGUAGES.

(From *Campbell's Travels in South Africa.*)I.—*The Lord's Prayer in the Hottentot Language.*

Cita üp ne nanoop na, sa ons anoohe, sa koop
Our Father the Heaven in thy name hallowed be thy kingdom,
 ha, sa ei i hoop ei ne nanoop na koomni, cita
come thy will be done earth on the Heaven in as our
 cecorobe berip mata neci, i cita sobrootikoo oobekata
daily bread give us this day and our debts forgive us
 cita soorooti aukoo citee oobeka koomni, i ta oowa
our indebted men we forgive as and not temptation
 keikata, gawe coreta eip ga; o sa ne koop ke, i
lead us but deliver us evil from for thine the kingdom is and
 de keip, i de isa i amo.
the power and the glory in eternity.

II.—*In the Language of Madagascar.*

Rait-sica an-danghitsu, angare ano ho fissa tife i fansap ano
Father our in Heaven name thy magnified be, kingdom thy
 evi aminaic; amorompo-an oho esa iz an tamme oucoua
come to us the pleasure of thy heart be done in earth as if
 an-danghitsu. Mahoume anaie ananenai anrouanne moufe
in Heaven give to us for our support day this bread
 abi. Tane i ou zahaie, o Zanbar, gui fannahenae ratsi abi; toua
all remit to us o God trespasses our evil all as
 ziae mivale i fanuahe ratsi a gni rafi naie; aca manatitse anaie
we forgive iniquities enemies to our do not lead us in
 vete-vetse ratsi; fea ano millenesa auiae tabin ratsi abi.
conceptions evil but thou deliver us from evil all.

Numbers in Madagascar.

Rec, one. Roue, two. Telou, three. Effat, four. Dinni, five.
 Henne, six. Fitou, seven. Valou, eight. Civi, nine. Polou, ten.
 Zatou, hundred. Arrive, thousand.

Velius Longus informs us that it was not unusual to write *kis*, *ka*, *kid*, for *quis*, *qua*, *quid*. In some French editions of the beginning of the 16th century we find *kiskis*, *kankan*, for *quisquis*, *quamquam*. Niceron relates that a clergyman was deprived of his benefice for his presumption in pronouncing *quamquam* instead of *kankan*. The offender had the fortitude to appeal to the parliament of the province, who decreed "that he might use his discretion in his pronunciation."

*Votum JOANNIS COTTONI pro nepote suo carissimo
R. COTTONO, 1692.*

Cresce, puer, tecum et repetens exempla tuorum,
Exsuperat morum nobilitate genus.
Artibus ingenuis cultus sis, quicquid Athenæ,
Et quicquid nobis Roma diserta dedit.
Sisque, precor, magne subnixus robore mentis,
Et non fucata simplicitate bonus
Virtutis fidus sis custos, cultor honesti;
Et veræ semper Religionis amans.
Mollia tranquillæ currant tibi tempora vita,
Et veniat tardo cana senecta pede!

A. L.

SACRED DRAMAS.—The following title of the *Mystery of the Acts of the Apostles* is a curious specimen of the taste and language of the time:—“ Les Catholiques Œuvres & Actes des Apôtres, rédigez en escript par Saint Luc Evangéliste, & Historiographe, icellui S. Luc escrivant à Théophile, avec plusieurs histoires en icellui insérées des gestes des Césars. Le tout vnu & corrigé bien & duement selou la vraie vérité, & joué par personnages à Paris en l'hostel de Flandres, l'an mil cinq cents quarante ung. Avec privilège du Roy.”

“ The *Antiquarius*, by the ancients called *Librarius*, wrote after another person, called the *Dictator*, who held the original and dictated. As the Greek pronunciation differs from ours, if the Dictator says τις, τῆς, ταῖς, or τοῖς, the Antiquarius, who perhaps did not regard the sense or connexion, wrote down τις; for the Greeks pronounce all these words alike. In time the orthography changed in the Greek tongue, as it has done in others. The Greeks did not endeavour to reform their language to the pure Attic of Isocrates; but rather seemed in their MSS. to write many words, not as they were in the original, but according to the more modern fashion; as the Normanno-Saxons, in transcribing old copies, corrupted the orthography. To instance an old MS. I may cite the old fragments in the Greek Gospels in the Cotton Library, written in large ancient letters of silver and gold, which I take to be older than the Alexandrian MS. from the form of the letters. In these fragments are the same faults, as ΤΗΙΠΑΝ for στηίραν, ΚΤΡΗΝΕΟΝ for Κυρηναῖον, ΕΡΧΟΜΕ ΚΑΙ ΠΑΡΑΙΗΜ-ΨΟΜΕ for ἔρχομαι καὶ παραληφομαι, ΕΙΜΕΙ for εἰμι, ΜΙΖΩΝ for μιζέων, and many others.” 1700. H. WANLEY.

A. L.

*Quid dedicatum poscit Apollinem
Vates?*

Phœbe, fave; sanctas humili pede proterit aras
Advena, liminibus jam novus hospes adest.
Phœbe, fave; insanas vellem depellere curas,
Molliter et totos vivere posse dies.
A me livor edax, longèque inanabilis absit
Invidia, et, pectus qui premit, absit amor..
Absit amor, quem te, Daphnen per celsa sequentem
Culmina, telorum vi superiasse ferunt.
Victus eras. Puro nos et cedamus amori,
Huic me non pigate succubuisse Deo.
Arma, in me verte arma; Deus, felicibus uor
Vulneribus, nunquam queis caruisse decet.
Heu!—perco! tantorum ubi erit medicina dolorum?
Nunc scio quid contra sit capere arma Deos.
Emorior, dum te video, mea Delia; dum te,
Delia, non video, non minus emorior.
Phœbe, meum vestro caruit medicamine vulnus,
Nunc, Deus, optatam nunc, rogo, confer opem.
Quæ voces animum flectent? quo carmine nymphæ
Insinuem tenero milia tela sinu?
Quid sit amor, novi; docuit me Delia amorem;
Hanc quoque crudelē fas didicisse Deum.
Si faveas votis, tibi tunc venerande, capella
Ante cadet sacras sanguinolenta fores.
Esto, Nunc mea sit conjux carissima, nec te,
Alme, piget precibus, Phœbe, favere meis.
Sit casa parva quidem, sed sit mihi lauta supellex,
Unde brevis mensæ detur habcre dapes.
Non equidem optarim multos numerare sodales,
Neve mihi exiguos turba sit ante fores.
Adsit rara cohors, at, sit, (Deus, annue votis,)
Quisque mihi fidâ junctus amicitia.
Rura colam, sylvæque petens inglorius umbras
Te recinem densis, Phœbe, sub arboribus;
Sylvestresque humili modulatus arundine musas,
Dicam equidem quicquid dicere suadet amor.
Ah! talem in tuto liceat si ducere vitam,
Nestoris ut vellem vivere posse dies.
Non mihi fas vel erit tardam metuuisse senectam,
Vel si aderit rapido mors properata pede.
Et, si mors aderit,—si te, mea Delia, linquam,
Saltem habcam moriens deficiente manu.
At quando hora venit, quâ tu “vale,” Delia, dices,
Hoc mihi restabit dicere, “vita, vale!”

IN ETERNUM HONOREM ROBERTI BURNS.

Poetarum Caledoniæ sui ævi longe principi,
 Cujus carmina eximia, patro sermone scripta,
 Animi magis ardentis ingeniique vi,
 Quam arte vel cultu conspicua,
 Facetis, jucunditate, lepore, affluentia,
 Omníbus literarum cultoribus satis nota;
 Cives sui, necnon plerique omnes,
 Musarum amantissimi, memoriamque viri
 Arte poeticâ tam præclarî, soventes
 HOC MAUSOLEUM,
 Super reliquias poetae mortales,
 Extinendum curavere.
 Primum hujus ædifici lapideum
 Gulielmus Miles, Armiger,
 Republicæ architectonicæ apud Scotos
 In regione australi, Curio maximus Provincialis,
 Georgio Tertio regnante,
 Georgio, Walliae Principe,
 Summam imperii pro patre tenente,
 Josepho Gass, armigero, Dumfrisia Praefecto,
 Thoma J. Hunt, Londinensi, Architecto,
 Posuit,
 Nonis Janiis, Anno Lucis MDCCCXV
 Salutis Humanæ MDCCCXV.

G has often yielded its place to C: thus from קָמֵל *camelus* has been formed; λέλεγται has become λέλεχται; μίσγω, misceo; γωρυτὸς, corythus; *regtum*, *rectum*, &c. C is indeed the original character: G is called a new letter by Diomedes, and was unknown to the Romans before the first Punic war. According to Terentius Scaurus, it was introduced by Spurius Carvilius.

In our own times G has frequently given way to C. *Throgmorton* has been changed into *Throckmorton*, *Bugden* into *Buckden*; and will it not be said hereafter, that the *Isle of Dogs* should have been called the *Isle of Docks*?

Sometime after the return of Charles II. Dr. Isaac Barrow wrote the following distich:

Te magis optavit redditum, Carole, nemo;
 Et nemo sensit te rediisse minus.

? See *Vessius*, *Etymologicon*.

*Dialogue on the Installation of Pope Urbanus VIII. who has
been in his coat of arms:*

Gall. Gallis mella dabunt, Hispanis spicula figent.

Hisp. Spicula si figent, emorientur Apes.

Ital. Mella dabunt cunctis, nulli sua spicula figent :
Spicula nam princeps figere nescit Apum.

ΛΙΟΛΟΓΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΤΩΝ ΑΙΤΑΩΝ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣ,
SIVE APOLOGIA ECCLESIAE ANGLICANÆ,
AUCTORE JOANNE JUELLO, OLIM EPISCOPO SARISBURIENSI,
GR. E. C. QUIDDEM REFORMATÆ.
A JOANNE SMITH, A. B. Oxonii, 1639.

Nuper recensuit et notas addidit A. C. CAMPBELL, A. M.

PONTEFRACTI EXCIDIT B. BOOTHROYD, apud quem veneunt. Veneunt etiam
LONDINI apud Rivington et EBORACI apud bibliopolas.

1812.

THE appearance from a country press of such a work as we here intend to notice would have deserved at any period the attention of the scholar. The original Latin *APOLOGIA* was reprinted also in the same year at Pontefract; and an *English Translation illustrated with Historical Notes* came out from the same press in the year 1813—both of them, at this period, works well worthy the regard of the Theologian.

And yet we have little doubt that we are now making all the three for the first time known to the great body of our readers. We are desirous therefore to give such publicity to the whole, as may place them fairly before the eye of the learned world: an advantage hitherto lost, from the unostentatious nature of their appearance, and the retired modesty of the Editor and Translator.

Of the general merits of the *Apologia Ecclesie Anglicane* little need be said at this day. That is a point settled by the voice of ages. But what has long been displayed as panoply, may be worn again as armour. And the *Apology* of Jewel—in that view—bears too strongly upon the great Protestant controversy, to be talked of merely—and neglected—by the present generation of Divines.

For if the Romish Church in faith and in practice be indeed ever the same and know not even the shadow of turning; this master piece of animated and vigorous argument pleads for our continued separation from the Church of Rome, on the very same

ground of errors and abuses which justified our first departure from her pale.

On any other supposition, let us ask the most learned and liberal of that Communion for their own history of their own variations. And taking the state of the question from the *Apologia*, let them avow, what acts of personal and official misconduct in their Popes and Prelates there recited, they condemn or deny; and what corruptions in their discipline there attacked, they give up as indefensible. Finally, let them demonstrate, if they can, what points of their doctrine there exhibited, as gross and unscriptural, are now entertained by their people, in a sense less discrepant to the gospel and less abhorrent to rational belief.

But all this perhaps, in a *Classical Journal*, is so much digression. What we promised to our readers strictly, was a critical notice of Smith's Greek version, as a curiosity in literature. We proceed accordingly.

The two editions of the work were published at Oxford, yet even in that university, its birth place, copies of either, we believe, are now very scarce and very little known. The *third edition* (such only we suppose it to be,) lately edited by Mr. Campbell, is presented, by a very appropriate *dedication* written in Greek, to the Bishop of Durham; as having been undertaken at his kind suggestion and as being naturally connected with a name so distinguished for Protestant zeal.

Though somewhat out of order, we are inclined to quote the following sentence from that peculiarity of syntax in it called an Attic solecism; which, because from inadvertence some of the ancients might speak so now and then, the Sophists, to give a new turn and quaintness to their style, affected every where as a beauty.

συγελόντι δὲ εἰπεῖν, ΕΓΩ δὴ ΕΙ τὴν τοῦ Δημοσθένους σεμνότητα, ἡ τὸν τοῦ Κικέρωνος όγκον, ἡ τὴν τοῦ Παύλου σπουδὴν ΛΗΠΤΟΤΝ ΕΔΟΞΕΝ δὲ εἰς τὰ μέσον φέρειν ταύτην τὴν τοῦ Ιουέλλου ἀπολογίαν.

Qu. Does the peculiarity remarked above admit of defence as correctly Attic? or must it be excused only as an Attic ἀνακόλουθον?

The *Preface*, also written in Greek, states, with courtesy and thanks, that Mr. Campbell was indebted to the biographer of Sir Philip Sidney and of Isaac Walton, "the pious and learned Dr. Zouch," for a copy of the *second edition*, from which his own was reprinted. We are told also, that Smith was one of the fellows of Magdalen; but from something singular in Mr. Campbell's phrase, it appears doubtful, whether he ever advanced beyond the degree of B.A. And Smith, perhaps, presents one more instance of the precarious vitality of great early talent.

Mr. Campbell in his Preface to the Latin Apologia writes thus :

" The scarcity of this valuable book, besides its own merit, induced the Editor to revive it in such a form, as might render it accessible to youth. The addition of Smith's Greek Translation will certainly be deemed an improvement; as it has great merit, not only in point of language, but from making the sense of the original clearer."

Now though at this moment we are not prepared with facts exactly to illustrate Mr. C.'s last assertion in the paragraph just quoted; yet we cannot but echo his general compliment to the translator—τὰ τοῦ Ιουέλλου νόηματα οὐχ ὅτι τῇ λέξει τῇ σαφεστάτῃ ἀναπτύξας, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐνεργείᾳ τῇ βητορικῇ λαμπρύνει.

And in the mean while to show how much the Greek language in point of precision surpasses all others with which it is usually compared; we refer our readers to the foot of the page.¹ The distinction there drawn with great acuteness and justice by the eminent prelate already mentioned, is so strikingly to the purpose that we could not pass it by.

With all our respect to Mr. C. for his zeal and ability as an

¹ I cannot help thinking that some misconception and perversion of the Scripture doctrine of salvation may have arisen from an ambiguity in the words "saved by faith without works," arising from the different meanings which may be annexed to them accordingly as they are spoken or written. If we could have been saved by our own good works, Christ would have died in vain. But, as we cannot be saved *by works*, God has mercifully appointed, that we shall be saved *by faith, without works*. But to be "saved by faith, without works," that is, *per fidem, nullo operum adjumento*, has a very different meaning from being saved *by faith without works*, that is, *per fidem infructuosam*.

In the first sense, *without works*, is the attribute of the verb; in the second, it is the attribute of the noun. The difference is still more striking in Greek. We are saved διὰ πίστεως, ἀνενέργως, but not διὰ πίστεως τῆς ἀνενέργως. For, we are saved *by faith—without works*; but not *by the faith which is without works*. The former sense, by admitting that we are saved not by works, (for our best works are far short of our duty,) but by an atonement of infinitely greater value, does not exclude the necessity of good works: but the latter supposes the validity of a faith unproductive of good works, a sense contrary to the whole tenor of Scripture. To be saved, *without works* (that is, not by our own good works, but) *by faith*, is not subject to the same ambiguity as, to be "saved *by faith without works*." Sermons, Charges, and Tracts, by Shute, Bishop of Durham. London, 1811. pp. 294, 5. Note.

Editor, we have to complain, however, that he has neglected one part of his duty. He ought to have entertained and instructed the purchasers of Smith's Greek version with Smith's own Epistle to President Langton (the Roule, we may well presume, of his day) dated Anno 1613. Juli 22, and with his Preface *Lectori φιλέλλην* alike worthy of preservation. Without these two pieces, we must pronounce Mr. C.'s edition imperfect; and shall supply the defect, by reprinting them intire from the first edition in 1614. The second of 1639 is not at our command.

After he has gratified his curiosity by the perusal of the Epistle and the Preface, let the Greek Scholar take up the version itself with the Latin original before him. And we shall endeavour at an early day to meet him again with a few remarks on Smith's execution of the task; which it would be trespassing too far on the pages of this Journal to insert at present.

N* N** N***

'ΑΠΟΛΟΙΤΑ ΤΗΣ "ΑΓΓΛΩΝ
 Ἐκδηλησίας Ἑλληνιστὶ μεταφρασθεῖσα.
 APOLOGIA ECCLESIE ANGLICANE GRÆCE VERSA.
 Interprete I. S. Bacch. in Art.
 Πρωτοπείρῳ συγγράμμη.

OXONIE,
 Excudebat Josephus Barnesius. 1614.

CLARISSIMO, doctissimoque viro D. Doctori Langton, Collegii Magdalenensis Praesidi dignissimo.

Non equidem faciam (Ornatissime Praeses) ut quando tibi scribo, Graecarum literarum cognitionem dilaudare videar. Est illa jam pervagata satis opinio, qui harum sit prorsus expers, doctum nequaquam esse perhibendum. Enimvero tantopere nostram hoc seculum iis deditum esse videmus, ut quin apud prioris temporis horunctiones proverbio increbuerit, *Gracum est, non potest legi;* contra nihil fere nunc legatur, praterquam aut ipsa Graecorum scripta, aut quod eorum oleat disciplinas. Neque vero praelarum id sibi ducunt homines nostri, si quomodo cumque sic scripta intelligent: quin et ipsi quoque lascivientes (ut fit) *ex περιουσίᾳ Gracē* scripturiunt. Hinc pridem illæ nou tam geminis distinctæ, quam gemineæ Budæi Epistolæ: quas elegantes profecto dicerem, nisi meras judicassem elegantias. Hinc suum nobis peplum, opus pulchre Medius fidius variegatum, proximis istis diebus misit Heinßius. Hinc etiam ante paucos annos Cottonus literas ad Camierum (pruriente mirum ni ambitione Jesuiticâ) Graecas dedit. Mitto Fulviam Olympiam Moratam, seu femininam, ætate puellam,

genere nobilem, hac tamen palæstra vix ulli secundam. Vident scilicet quod res est : otiosam esse lectionem : doctrinæ judicium e scriptis faciendum : juxta vetus hemistichium : ἐργα δὲ χειρας ἀλέγχει. Proinde quum nuper nescio quibus auspiciis ad hæc me studia serio applicuisse, putavi non esse prius conquiescendum, quam illud esse assequuntus, ut etiam Græco idiomate mentis meæ sensus utcunque profarer. Nam eorum sane haud probo institutum, qui seu laboris tædio, seu invitâ quadam animi levitate, seu ἀψικορίᾳ² communi illo multorum adolescentium vitio labo-rantes, defunctionam huic linguae navant operam, tautumque ponunt in cā temporis, quantum satis fore credunt ad popularem ostentationem : solidam vero et accuratam cognitionem aiunt se miuimo desiderare.

Illud porro exercitamenti genus omnium pariter honestissimum utilissimumque semper existimavi, quo sententiam alienam nostris verbis interpretamur, et quod prius Latinè dictum est, Græcum facimus. Alioqui sæpe contingit præ nimio vocularum aucupio rem ipsam negligi : cumque politè non possumus dicere, quæ cogitamus, ea cogitemus, quæ politè dicere valeamus.

Quippe cuiuslibet est liberè vagari, suumque sequi impetum ; verum ad certos quasi modos incedere, et alterius tantum vestigis inhærere, mirabor si quis unquam temere potuit. Unde, neminem videmus tam esse felici ingenio, quin operosiùs multo scribat propria, quam intelligit aliena : veritatque aliena, quam scribit propria. Interim quod a preceptoribus dicendi rectè observatum legimus,³ difficiliora debent esse quæ exercent, quo sit levius illud, in quod exercent ; ut Athletæ ponderibus plumbeis assuefaciunt manus, quibus vacuis et nudis in certamine utendum est. Hæc ubi satis comperisseem, proximum fuit despicere certum authorem : nullus autem prius occurrit hoc ipso, quem nunc præ manibus habes, Juello.

Audacter (inquis) factum. Itane oportuit ἐν πίλῳ τὴν κεραμείαν.
' Evidem non habeo (Vir Optime) quod respondeam. Liber enim iste quæ divinâ ipsius argumenti sublimitate, quæ profluentis dictionis ubertate, vel exercitatissimum quemque interpretem, Græcaeque linguae peritissimum torqueret : et vero Stephanus, Whitakerus, Sylburgius, doctissimi (probè constat) homines, non nisi minutos quosdam Catechismos aggrediebantur. Quid igitur ? Ego possum, illi non potuerunt : Nequaquam, ita me ament Musæ : sed ut uno verbo expediam, volui, quod Græcis in proverbio est,⁴

¹ Suidas in ἀλέγχω.

² Aristot. Rhe. 2. c. I.

³ M. Fab. II. cap. 2.

⁴ Eustat. in Iliad. Λ et P ubi etiam interpretatur ἐν φάσει καὶ ὄλεσσον.

Ἑπειρούς ξύλου καὶ ἀπάγξασθαι, ut si desperanda esset laus omnis, venia saltem foret paratior.

Atqui multo fortassis habitior, multoque venustior haec mea prodiisset interpretatio, si non quotidiana Graecorum authorum lectio, unde stulos et sanguinem et colorem trahit; partim afflictam corporis valetudine, partim rusticam peregrinatione, partim aliis importunis negotiis, nimis, heu nimis diu abrupta jacurisset. Adde quod in eas redactas sum temporis angustias, ut sancte affirmare possim, intra spatum unius sesquimensis totum opus mihi planè confectum. Quare tametsi cum¹ Iucullo non dicam, idemco me barbara guardam et soloeca dispersisse, quod facilis hanc meam probem esse tralationem: vereor tamen ne qua minus Attica, dum nimium festino, passim urepserint; adeoque authorem arguant vel imperitum, (qualem utique me lubeus profiteor) vel a tempore saltem imparatum. Ceterum imprimis hic tria videbis verborum monstra, quae nec Athenis nata sunt, nec illud sapient cœlum, videlicet Ἰησοῦς, Βαύλλας, Ἰνδοῦλγεντίας. Hæc autem propterea sunt à me posita, quod in amplissimis Graecia latifundis,² nulla reperiebam vocabula, quibus isthac singula propriæ satis enunciarentur. Néque mutum id eniā videri debet. Si enim eruditissima Graecorum natio non habeat (attestante M.³ Cicerone) quo ineptum exprimat; quid⁴ has ineptiarum omnium ineptissimas, has amenias, haec fanaticæ delirantium sonnia, quo tandem nomine appellabit? Quintam illud seras velim, tanto pluris apud me fidehtatem esse, quam eloquentiam, ut religiosè caverim, necubi forte captandis phrasibus ab Jueth mente vel omnimum discederem. Itaque verisimile est nonnusquam Graecæ lingue me vim intulisse, dám scilicet aciem animi aliorum intenderim. Verum ista quanquam defendere licet⁵ exemplis haud vulgaribus; tamen humanitati tuæ condonanda potius relinquo. Non sum profectò, non sum adeò vecors, ut meorum quicquam hac præsertim ætate sine venia placere putem: nec ita tui oblitus, ut eam a te vel petere dubitem, vel impetrare desperem. Faxis igitur (Præses Integerime) calidum hoc meum et planè juvenile incœptum, nimium periculosa plenum opus aleæ, boni consulas; et interpretationem hanc, quam qualem, certe quidem observantia tesseram, candide velis interpretari. Quod si propitium hic te fuero expertus, alia posthac, at alijs ea quoque generis me spero allaturum:

¹ Tul. ad Atticum L. 1.

² Nam ἀφέσσως σημασία (quo utuntur oī OB Levit. 25.) haud scio, an Jubilæis Papisticis ita quadraret.

³ 2 De Oratore.

⁴ Videor enim permultos Latinismos in Novo Test. reperisse v. g. Lucæ 12, 58. δὸς ἐργασίαν ἀπῆλλαχθαι: ubi vel cæcis manifestum est Romanum illud: Dare operam.

Nam tibi, quod nobis superest ignobilis oti,
Deputo, sive legas, quæ dabo, sive tegas.¹

Anno 1613. Julii 22.

Dignitati tuæ
devinctissimus,

JOH. SMITH.

LECTORI *ΦΙΛΕΛΛΗΝΙ.*

Cum superiorem scriberem epistolam, nihil profecto minus cogitavi, quam de hoc libro in lucem emitendo. Quare satis habui ornatissimo illi viro, cui pro Collegii consuetudine aliquod tunc temporis industriae specimen exhibendum fuit, meum in eo tum suscipiendo, tum perficiendo, consilium probasse. Nunc autem quandoquidem in tuas etiam manus hoc nostrum *νεαντευμα* peruenturum est, oratum te maximopere cupio, (Lector Candide,) ne *Juellus* minoiris apud te fiat jam pallatus, quam fuit olim togatus: Non sane quin multum intersit; veruntamen quia idem utrobique *Juellus* est, eodem loco esse convenit. Quanquam suspicor aliquos minime defuturos (ita hodie sibi placent homines aliorum scriptis censendis) qui me dum e Latino Græcum feci, rem novam præstutisse clauditent, atque adeo plane supervacuam. Næ isti nondum vidisse videantur *Erasmus* a *Caversino*, a *Garā Ciceronem*, a *Scaligero Catonem*, *Cesarem* ab *Anonymous* quodam, ab aliis alios jamdudum Græce versos: Alioqui puderet eos, vel novum dicere, quod tam multi, vel supervacuum, quod tam egregii viri factitariunt.

Imo si² *Cassianum* illud ubique sit spectandum, *Cui bono*, equeidem ipse expertus ausim affirmare, pueros Grammaticales, (quibus utique meum hoc, quicquid est opellæ, destinatum volo) citius e balbutientibus hujusmodi versionibus, quam e doctissimis Demosthenis Platonisve monumentis Græcae linguae scientiam adepturos. Siquidem nusquam ita obtinet Comici dictum,³ ἀμα. θέστιγν καὶ σαφέστερον, ac ubi cum tyrannulis agitur; qui, si modico praecedas intervallo, statim sectari solent: sin longius præcurras, aut nolant omnino sequi, aut nesciunt consequi. At enim fortassis utiliter quidem hoc fieri posse non negas, præstantiorem duntaxat requiris artificem. Ita vero si tu sentis, mecum profecto sentis: nam et ego meæ probe sum conscientis infirmitatis, et aliorum vires quas ignoro, maiores esse credo. Quocirca timidus ac subinvitus Mehercles prodeo, necnon sicut Jupiter Homericus,⁴ ἐκών αἴκοντί γε

¹ Auson. Epigr.

² *Tull. orat. pro Scrt. Rose. Amerino.*

³ *Aristoph. in Ranis e Bacchi personâ.*

⁴ *Iliad. Δ.*

θημῷ. Nam quid amabo facerem, cum illi rogarent, quā imperare possent? Fallor, aut ipse obtemperasses. Et vero quia videbam Graecarum literarum studia sic apud plurimos frigere, ut eas prorsus negligant; sic a paucis coli, ut sibi tantum ac Musis canentes, nihil in communem usum proferant: putavi hae ratione cum illos cōhortandos, tūnī hos coargendos.

Nimis autem vereor (*Pie Lector*) ut faciat ad stomachum tuum, quod νῆ Δία sapientula dixerim, idque in opere Christiano; non illud quidem ex antiquis Ecclesie partibus petitum, sed tamen spectatissimis Evangelii professoribus valde usurpatum. Nec absque ratione. Cum enim Theologi nostri, etiam qui melioris notae sunt, Κέδεπολ, Εκαστορ, et hoc genus alia libris suis Latinis scriptis passim inspergant; Evidēt Graecis tantundem non conceditur? Aut si qua verbis mest religio, quin ergo neges Mysterii vocabulum à profanis et absurdis Graecorum superstitionibus primò fluxisse? Quid quod ipsi illi scriptores Exoterici, νῆ Δία (quoad ego coniicio) sic oti solent, ut affirmare magis, quam jurare videatur? Et nonnunquam certè, vel Adeò tantum significat, et sententiæ notat incrementum: vel priorsus vacat, nihilque aliud, quam orationis lacunas explet. Sive igitur verbum hoc jam inde ab initio probum fuerit, sive postcā longo usu coepit emolliri, seu deinde magniorum authorum exemplis aliquantum hic quoque audere liceat: quicquid est, non erit profecto cōdoris tui, (*Lector Optimus*) non humanitatis, quando de te ipsâ tecum plene sentiam, voculas meas sollicitius calumniari.

MOTS OU OMIS PAR H. ETIENNE, *On incorrectement expliqués.*

Par J. B. GAIL, Lecteur et Professeur Royal de l'Institut de France.

No. II. [*Continued from No. XXIII. p. 219.*]

LES articles de cette 2^e série, ainsi que les précédents, offrent des interprétations non recueillies ça et là, mais prodigues pour la première fois. Je ne puis donc vous les adresser comme définitives et arrêtées: je crois donc, qu'avant de les adopter dans votre réimpression du précieux trésor d'H. Etienne, il convient de les annoncer dans votre Journal, et de les soumettre à la critique de vos compatriotes (*τις τεῖπας ἐρχεσθαι*). Leur suffrage peut seul mettre le scén̄ aux découvertes dont j'ai à cœur d'enrichir la critique grammaticale.

16. *βρότος*, où, *homme*; mais *βρότος*, avec l'accent sur la penultième, signifiera, dit-on, sang mêlé de poussière, *sang corrompu*. H. Etienne, après avoir, d'après Virgile et autres poètes Latins, souvent scholiastes des Grecs, donné *tabum*, (*pus, humeur virulente*) et *sanies*, (*sang décomposé, humeur sanguinolente*) comme version de *βρότος*, cite le *βρότον αἰματόεντα* d'Homère, (Il. xxiii. 41.) qu'Eustathe explique par *τὸν ἐκ τοῦ αἷματος μόλυντον, tache de sang*, et ajoute que le *λύθρον* d'Hesychius, *sang mêlé de poussière*, lui paraît répondre quelquefois au *βρότον* d'Homère. Sans contester à H. Etienne le rapprochement qu'il fait, je dirai que dans le passage d'Homère précité, l'interprétation d'Eustathe me plaît davantage.

Mais, dira-t-on, si *βρότος* signifie *tache de sang*, *τὸν ἐκ τοῦ αἷματος μόλυντον*, comment justifier l'épithète *αἰματόεντα*? Nous la justifierons en répondant qu'Homère aime les pléonasmes, non pas ceux qui sont oiseux et rédondants,¹ mais ceux qui servent à produire un effet ou à faire une image. Or ici *αἰματόεντα* accompagne fort heureusement *βρότον*, et nous montre non pas une petite *tache de sang*, mais une *tache large*, et qui semble s'agrandir de cet adjectif composé de 5 syllabes.

17. *eis, eis* se prend-il pour *ἐν?* oui, répondent H. Etienne, (t. i. p. 1156. C.) Maittaire, M. Sturz, M. Hermann, et tant d'autres critiques aussi justement célèbres: pour moi, j'oserois presque dire *non*. Pour étayer leur doctrine que je crois erronée, ils citent cette phrase de Deuys d'Halic. (Liv. v. p. 276. ed. Francf. 1586.) *ταῦτα τὰ γρίψατα λαζάριτες οἱ καταδειφθέντες ὑπὸ τοῦ τυράννου eis τὸ στρατόπεδον, Tīros Ἐργάριον καὶ M. Ὁράτιος ἀνέγνωσαν ἐν ἐκλογοῖς*, mais ils ne paroissent se tromper. 1^o. Après *τυράννου*, je mets une virgule; 2^o, je fais dépendre *ἐν τῷ στρατόπεδον* non de *καταδειφθέντες*, mais de *ἀνέγνωσαν*. M. Sturz. (Lexie. Xen.) cite encore la phrase suivante: *roulez-vous*, dit Xenophon, (Iππρ. v. 7.) *dissimuler les forces de la cavalerie, laissez en une partie à découvert, et cachez l'autre dans un endroit que n'apperçoive pas l'ennemi, τοὺς δὲ eis τῷ ἄδηλον ἀποκρύπτων*. Ici, dira-t-on, *eis τῷ ἄδηλον* pour *ἐν τῷ ἄδηλῳ*: erreur, car *eis τῷ ἄδηλον* dépend d'un verbe de mouvement sous-entendu; ainsi ellipse à reconnoître ici.² J'aurai occasion d'expliquer ailleurs une foule d'exemples qu'on croiroit pouvoir m'opposer avec quelque avantage; exemples, où *eis* signifie non pas *dans*, mais *en présence de*: distinction trop méconue.

18. *ἐπὶ* avec le génitif se prend-il pour *eis* avec l'accusatif? Oui, dira-t-on encore d'après H. Etienne, (t. i. p. 1209. F.) d'après Suidas, et d'après M. Heyne, expliquant ce vers d'Homère, (Il. iii. 5.) *πέτονται ἐπ' Ακευνῶν βούσσων*. Pour moi, ici encore, comme au précédent article, admettant *ellipse*, et non pas *atticisme*, (car l'ellipse est de tous

¹ Voy. ma Grammaire Grecque, p. 244. et la note 1.

² La phrase pleine et sans ellipse seroit, *cachant l'autre partie (de la cavalerie) amenée dans un endroit non vu de l'ennemi*.

les dialectes) je dirai, la phrase pleine est, *les grues volent vers les rives (méridionales) de l'océan, où pourtant, et s'arrêtent sur ces rives,* ἐπὶ ψοάων.

19. ἐπὶ, avec le génitif, fait souvent difficulté : exemples — ἐπὶ τῷ ποταμῷ, *se tenir à l'entrée du fleuve, et les pieds dans l'eau, comme si on alloit le traverser, mais ne le traversant pas.* Xen. 'Ae. 4. 3. 28. t. iv. p. 134. de mon Xénophon Grec-Latin-Fr. p. 134.

20. κακεῖω pour κακεῖω, par synecope Aeolique, dit un savant qui ajoute *quod est κομητικῶς ἔχει*, dormituirre : cette notion est-elle exacte ? oui, si l'on en croit soit H. Etienne, qui traduit *decumbere* 'cupio, soit Constantin, qui d'après Didyme rend *κακεῖωτες* par *dormitirentes*, en ajoutant *magis enim somni cupiditas quam tempus significatur, quod verbis istis in εἰω pene familiare est*, sicut πολεμησίω bellaturio. Pour moi, fondé sur les principes des radicaux et des désinences, principes propres à prévenir quantité d'erreurs en Grec, en François, en Latin,¹ je dirai, que le verbe *κακεῖω* n'est point un verbe de désir, comme le prétend H. Etienne (*est*, dit-il, *hoc verbum desideratum sicut multa alia in εἰω desinentia*) ; que la désinence de ce verbe est *ω* et non pas *ει* ; que *ει* appartient uniquement au radical *κει* ; et ensu que *κακεῖω* signifie, *se mettre en place, étendu tout de son long ; être couché, ou se coucher : et, par extension, dormir.* Voy. dans le *Classical Journal*, No. XXIII. le mot *ρυμφάρηστος*, qui, ainsi que tant d'autres mots, me semble avoir été mal compris, faute de bien distinguer ce qui est radical de ce qui tient à la désinence.

21. πέλομαι sum, idem quod activum πέλω, et πέλω poet. pour *cipi*. Telle est la doctrine de H. Etienne (p. 1624 et 1627. de son App.) : mais ce mot n'a-t-il pas un autre sens plus vrai et plus digne d'attention ! à l'idée d'être, à l'idée de présence ne joint il pas celle de présence prenant part à ce qui se passe (comme l'intérêt des Latins), de présence agissante et efficace, comme dans ce vers d'Homère, (Il. xiii. 237, 238.) συμφερή δύπετη πέλει ἀδρῶν καὶ μάλι λυγρῶν, vers à l'occasion duquel M. Heyne s'écrie, *tricantur grammatici et molestias faciunt.* Chez Sponde συμφερή signifie *utile, avantageuse* ; ensorte que Thoas auroit dit simplement que la force de plusieurs hommes d'ailleurs faibles est avantageuse ; ce qui ne rend nullement toute la pensée d'Homère : car ce poète parle de forces réunies, tandis que dans l'interprétation de Sponde et autres, il n'est pas question de réunion.

D'autres traduisent, et très bien, l'adjectif συμφερή par *in unum collata* (réunie), mais πέλει les embarrasse. Pour en sortir, ne pourroit-on pas, comme je l'ai dit en commençant, joindre à l'idée de présence, celle de présence agissante et efficace, et traduire littéralement : *la force de plusieurs hommes, même d'hommes le moins belli-*

¹ Voy. mes *Essais sur les désinences, observ. prélimin.* p. 8. l. 5.

queuz, peut beaucoup (ou produit un grand effet) quand elle est réunie; et nous, (dit Thoas à Idoménée) nous savons (sommes exercés à) combattre contre des gens de cœur. Ainsi d'après cet exemple et tant d'autres, πέλω signifieroit être, mais surtout, être présent et prenant part à une chose, et, par extension, opérer puissamment, agir avec énergie, produire un grand effet. Ainsi loin de nous l'idée d'H. Etienne que la fonction de ce mot soit de s'employer poétiquement pour εἰπὶ συν. Xenophon ne se sert pas une seule fois de πέλομαι, que je crois avoir rencontré dans Thucydide.

22. ποικιλότραυλος, ὁ καὶ ἡ. H. Etienne qui donne ce composé, et qui l'explique par *varie balbutiens*, auroit bien du citer la source où il puisoit. Daniel Scott qui lui en fait le reproche avant moi, supplie l'omission et cite les deux vers où se trouve ποικιλάτραυλος en l'attribuant à un Anonyme, tandisque Reiske, Bruck, M. Harlez et autres les adjugent à Théocrite. Voici les vers, Εἰαρτοί δὲ λεγμόθογγουσιν ἀοδᾶς Κόσσηναι ἀχεῖσιν ποικιλότραυλα μελη. Scott les cite, donc, mais ne les explique pas. L'interprète Latin traduit, *Fernae autem stridulis cantibus Merulæ modulantur varic sonora carmina;* dans cette version, *varic* explique ποικιλος, mais le sens de τραυλος n'est certainement pas rendu par *sonorus*. *Sonorus, sonore*, qui rend des sons éclatans, ne convient certainement pas au merle. Dire que le merle rend des sons éclatans, attribuer ce sens au mot Grec, c'est faire une faute en histoire naturelle, et pécher contre le génie de la langue. En effet, à remonter à l'étymologie, τραυλος vient de τραυω blesser; mais l'idée de *blessures* ne conduit pas à celle de *sous éclatans*. En suivant donc l'étymologie que justifie les observations des naturalistes, je proposerois, *le merle à tremblante modulation, au gosier cherrotant*. En effet ses accents sont tremblans et interrompus. Pline dit du merle, *Merula astata canit, hyeme balbutit*: ce qui s'accorde mal avec l'épithète Εἰαρτοί de Théocrite. Que de plus habiles concilient le poète avec le naturaliste. Au reste, remarquons le *balbutiens* d'H. Etienne que lui a inspiré Pline, et qui avoit besoin, je crois, d'être commenté.

23. ὑπέρ, ὑπὸ suivi d'un génitif est souvent mal compris. Je ne releverais pas eu ce moment les inexactes interpretations qu'en donne H. Etienne. Je tacherai de suppleer, en partie, à ce qu'il ne dit pas. Je prends un premier exemple dans l'heocrite. Ce poète (id. 26. 4.) nomme l'aspodèle τὸν ὑπέρ γῆς: Reiske sous entend γερόμενον, et adopte la version *humus nascentem*; M. Geoffroy traduit *l'aspodèle dont la terre est couverte*; Warton donne pour glose, *genus quoddam humilius*; et moi, pour version, *le rampant asphodèle*. Mais en expliquant un texte difficile d'après des faits et d'après la nature, meilleur interprète que les lexicographes et les philologues, nous dirons que τὸν ὑπέρ γῆς ἄργοδελος signifie non *le rampant asphodèle*, mais, au contraire, *l'aspodèle qui ne rampe pas*: l'aspodèle, plante herbacée qui s'élève au dessus de terre, et qu'on peut mettre au rang des arbrisseaux puisqu'il a quelquefois deux coudées de haut: eusorte qu'ici

ἐπέρ n'est point du tout pour *ἐπί sur*, et qu'il signifie *au dessus de*, et présente l'idée non *de ramper sur*, mais *de s'élever au dessus de la terre*.

ἐπέρ avec l'accusatif signifiera *ultrà, au delà*: exemples --*ἰπέρ τὰ ἐσκαρπέα πηδάν, sauter par dessus les fossés*: *ἴπέρ τὸν Ἑλλήσποντον οἰκεῖν, habiter au delà de l'Hellespont*. Dans les exemples suivants, 1°. *τὸν Κιττὸν τὸν ὑπέρ Μακεδονίας* (Xen. K. 11. 1.); 2°. *ἡ Αἰθιόπις τῆς ὑπέρ Αἰγύπτου* (Thuc. 2. 48. 1.); 3°. *Νυσαρ τὴν ὑπέρ Αἰγύπτου ἔοισαν ἐν τῇ Αἰθιόπῃ* (Hérodote 2. 14.). *ὑπέρ* signifiera t il *au delà*? non; mais je proposerai de traduire, 1°. *le mont Cittus qui avoisine la Macédoine*, et non *qui est au delà Macédoine*; 2°. *de la partie de l'Ethiopie qui touche et domine l'Egypte*, que Théocrite appelle *Χθαμαλὸς* (id. 17. 79.); 3°. *Nysa qui avoisine et domine l'Egypte, et qui est dans l'Ethiopie*, et non pas, avec un savant, *Nysc, ville d'Ethiopie, au dessus de l'Egypte*.

Nous le voyons, *ὑπέρ* avec le sens d'*ultrà, au delà*, doit être suivi d'un accusatif. Si l'on m'oppose l'*ὑπέρ ποταροῦ* d'Homère, (Il. xxiii. 73.) qui signifie *au delà du fleuve*, je répondrai qu'il y a ici ellipse, et que *ποταροῦ* dépend de *πότα* sous-entendu, *ὑπέρ*, elliptiquement, avec le génitif, au lieu de l'accusatif, ne doit pas plus surprendre que *ἄδοσθε*, (Il. xxiii. 137.) qui est au génitif, elliptiquement, pour *εἰς ἄδος δόπον*. Sur les prépositions, signes passifs, et qui jamais ne déterminent le cas, M. M. Wolf et Buttmann ont dit de très bonnes choses.

EURIPIDES EMENDATUS.

a G. B.

In particula hujus Diatrii nuperrime vulgata, video lectionem vulgaratam in Hipp. 77. sibi nactam esse patronum, qui, dum vivus interfuit, vir quidem inter τοὺς πολυμαθεστάτους nunquam nisi per honorifice fuit acceptus, verum inter τοὺς χριτικατάτους seu, si loqui malit candidus harum literarum et aequus iudex, τοὺς ὀνοματοβήρας, non eodem in honore habendus, Jacobus, aio, Bryantus. Ille enim dicitur in quadam templo Dianæ dicato versus illos Euripidis celeberrimos posuisse inscriptos, quos Hippolytus fingitur canere imagini Dianæ impositurus coronam.

*Σοὶ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφαγον ἐξ ἀκηράτου
λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω,
ἔνθ' οὔτε ποιμὴν ἀξιοῖ φέρβειν βότα,
οὔτ' ἥλθε πα σιδηρος· ἀλλ' ἀκήρατον*

μέλισσα λειμάν' ἔρινς τιέρχεται,
αἷως δὲ ποτεμίκισι κηπεῖται σφύταις.

Ubi tamen Bryantus adoptavit ἡῶς conjecturam Vossii, contra quem fortiter pugnat Brunckius aliquie, me quidem judge, felicissime. Verum in me recipere ausim, ut comprobarem illum locum esse ab omnibus laudatum, a nemine intellectum, neque ab Euripide scriptum eo modo, quo libri exhiberi solent. En argumenta, quae meam sententiam confirmare possunt. I. Δίηρος per se nusquam alibi significat *falcem messorium*. II. Si locus hujusmodi reperiretur, quod non posse auguror, nusquam repertum iri confido cum ἡῶς: coniunctum. III. Si ἡῶς τιμητική sit proba locutio, in re tali esset plane incepta: etenim non ille lucus, cui nulla fala immittitur, dici potest *Δίηρος*, verum is quem nemo vel hominum vel ceterorum animalium turbavit: quoniam vox non ducitur ab ἀnon et κείσθε τονδεο, verum ἀnon et κείσθε μισέο, vel κηραίνω, *cornūpō*. IV. Rectius animato aliuc quam inanimato μέλισσα poterat opponi. V. Patet e parodia Comici apud Athen. ix. p. 402. C. "Εὐ" οὔτε ποιήη ἀξινι νέμειν βότα οὔτ' ἀσχέδωρος νεμόνεος καπρώζεται animalis cuiusdam nomen hic olim fuisse scriptum. VI. Ovidius in Ioco sacro pingendo nullam falcis immissæ, necne mentionem facit, sed talem describit qualem *neque ovis placidae neque amantis saeu capellæ* *Nec patulo tarde carpitur ore bovis*. in Epist. Heroid. xvi. et, in Metam. iii. 408., *Quem neque pastores neque pastæ monte capellæ Contigerant, aliudve pecus, quem nulla volueris Nec sera turbarat*: quasi piaculum esset messoris opera uti, sine qua lucus horridus fuisset, neque Deo satis dignus: e contra probe commemoravit falcem messoriam, dum pingit steriles maris oras *Quas neque cornigeræ morsu læscere juvencæ, Nec placide carpsistis ores, hirtæve capellæ. Non apis inde tulit collectos sedula flores: Non data sunt capitì genitalia serta, neque unquam Falciferæ secuere manus.* VII. MS. Fl. longe præstantissimus omnium Codicum, qui hunc usque ad diem reliquias Euripideas conservant, modo quis probe dignoscere discat ejus lectiones, e quibus vel pravis non leve adjumentum ad probas cruendas trahi potest, opportune exhibit *Οὐδὲ ἡλθε πω σιδερος*: ut inde erui possit ἡλθε πως οὐδὲ ἀξινος: mox pro ἀκίρπτοι legi debet ἀκίρπτοι: quod Hesych. expavit per ἀβλαβη. Sententiam unice illustrat Nostras Churchill in Poemate dicto Gotham iii. 491.

*The bee goes forth; from herb to herb she flies,
From flow'r to flow'r, and loads her lab'ring thighs
With treasur'd sweets, robbing those flow'rs, which left
Find not themselves made poorer by the theft:
cui simile est illud in ejusdem poematis ii. 214.*

*walks o'er the opening flow'r,
Which largely drank all night of heav'n's fresh dew,
And, like a mountain nymph of Dian's crew,
So lightly walks, she not one mark imprints,
Nor brushes off the dew, nor soils the tints.*

Verum neque sic integer est locus. Etenim versus tres, qui vulgo excerptum illud sequuntur, Hippolyti orationem ordiri debent. Ii vulgo exstant: "Οστις ἀδειάτον μηδὲν ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει Τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεν εἰς τὰ πάντα ἀεὶ Τούτοις Ἐρέπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δὲ οὐ δύαις. At plerique codices πάνθ' ὄμως: et unus MS. pro var. lect. Ἐπεσθαι: hoc postremum est quantivis pretii: neque a vero longe abest τὰ πάντας ὄμως in τὸ πᾶν θέμις mutandum. Etenim modo in scenam intraverat Hippolytus, satellitibus stipatus, qui ἐν προσόδῳ carmen in Dianæ honorem accinunt, cuius initium est "Ἵππος ἀδοντες Ἐπεσθαι: eo finito, Hippolytus, qui inter canendum personam egerat mutam, ad Dianæ aram accedit, manu gerens coronam Dei simulacro imponendam. Sed ante vulgus arcet, quam sacra iniit, nec nisi viros tam mentis integros quam corporis esse fas dicit sibi comites adjungere:

"Οστις ἀδειάτον μηδὲν ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει
τὸ σωφρονεῖν εἰληχεν εἰς τὸ πᾶν, θέμις
τούτοις γ' Ἐπεσθαι, τοῖς κακοῖσι δὲ, οὐ δύαις.

quibus dictis, satellites dimovet et mox ad Deam convertit orationem:

Σὺ τόνδε πλεκτὸν στέφανον ἐξ ἀκηγάτου
λειμῶνος, ὃ δέσποινα, κοσμήσας φέρω.
Ἐνβ' οὗτε ποιμὴν ἔξιον φίγειν βότα,
οὔτ' ἡλιθ' ποὺς οὓς ἀρνος· ἀλλ' ἀκήγιον
μέλισσα λειμῶν' ἥρινὸς διέρχεται,
Αἰών: Εἰς ποταμίασι τηγανευει δρύσοις.

quæ sic reddi possunt Anglice—

He, whose unspotted heart no teacher owns
Save unsophisticated Nature, such
His steps may hither lead, but not the impure.
Dian, to deck thy brows this crown I bear
Of flow'rets from the mead untainted cull'd,
Where never herdsman led the grazing kine
Nor foot of lambkin trod: the vernal bee
May dare alone the meadow's sweets to sip,
Still unpolluted by the riffler's wing
That scarcely shakes the dew-drop—which, from font
As pure, the hand of Chastity repairs.

Cum versione nostra conferri potest illa Bryanti necnon Mureti,

quam neque a Valckenaero neque Monkō appositam, ipse lubens exscribam.

Tibi hanc corollam, diva, nexilem fero,
Aptam ex virentis pratuli intonsa coma.
Quo neque protervum pastor unquam agit pecus,
Neque falcis unquam venit acies improbae :
Apis una flores vere libat integros,
Puris honestus quos rigat lymphis Pudor.
Illi, magistri quos sine opera perpetem
Natura docuit ipsa temperantiam,
Fas carpere illinc ; improbis autem nefas.

CLASSICAL CRITICISM.

THE commentators on Virgil seem to acknowledge a difficulty in the following verse, which they have not, I think, succeeded in removing; perhaps the following remarks may throw some light on the passage.

Concedit furibunda rogos, ensenique recludit
Dardanum, non hos quasitum munus in usus. *Aeneid*, lib. iv. 647.

Here the words, *non hos quasitum munus in usus*, which are generally translated, *a present not intended for such purposes*, lead some critics to infer, that Æneas had made Dido a present of a sword, and in this sense it would appear that Ovid had considered it in his Epistle from Dido to Æneas,

Quam bene convenient fato tua munera nostio
Instruis impensa nostra sepulchra brevi. *Ep. vii. 187.*

and afterwards,

Hoc tamen in tumuli marmore carmen erit;
Praebuit Æneas et causam mortis, etensem.
Ipsa sua Dido concidit usa manu.

But, notwithstanding the high authority of Ovid, it may be fairly questioned whether any such present was given by Æneas; the presents he did give to Dido are all formally enumerated in the first book, v. 647-655. They consist of a mantle, a veil, a sceptre, a necklace, and a crown; but there is no sword in the list, and if any had been given, it would, I presume, have been mentioned with the rest. The commentators, therefore, aware of this objection, pretend that it was a present to Æneas, which, in his hurry to fly from Dido, he had left with some other things in his bed-chamber, as in verse 495.

— arma viri thalamo quæ fixa reliquit,
and 507.

— super exuvias eusenque relictum.

See Davidson's Virgil, and the following note in the Delphin Edition. "At non ait *datum*, sed *casu relictum in cubiculo*. Nec obstat quod cum *munus* appelleat. Sic enim ait: *non hos quesitum munus in usus, id est, non hos in usus quesitum et comparatum ab Aenea, cui munéris loco datus ab aliquo alio fuerat.*" But there was no occasion for the *ab aliquo alio* of the commentator, as he might have seen a little farther back that Dido had given Aeneas a sword as well as a garment, "*dives qua munera Dido fecerat.*" lib. iv. 260. If the sword must therefore be considered a *gift*, it is clearly the gift of Dido. The translators, however, seem at a loss in what way to take it. Dr. Trapp leaves the matter doubtful.

— "Unsheath the Trojan sword

A present not designed for such a use."

And Dryden gets rid of the difficulty, by leaving out the *gift* entirely:

"Unsheath the sword the Trojan left behind,
Not for so dire an enterprize design'd."

I find also in the Greek version of Virgil performed by the orders of Catherine II. Empress of Russia, that *munus* is rendered *κειμήλιον*, which converts the sword into a piece of household furniture.

*Βῆ τε πυρὴν μεργάλην εἴδυσσε τε ἐκ κολεοῦ
Δαρδάνων ξίφος, οὐκ ἐπὶ τῷ κειμήλιον ἔργῳ.*

The question, however, of *chattel*-property is supposed to be in favor of Dido, who had given the sword to Aeneas, *'Εχεῖν δὲ τυχὸν ὑπῆρχε τὸ ξίφος, ὅπερ Ἐρμῆς Αἰγαῖον κατείληφεν ἐξωσμένον.* (*Ἀνωτ. στιχ. 2.7.*) Yet Deille, who had doubtless all these authorities before him, is of a different opinion, and assigns the *donatio mortis causa* to Aeneas.

*"Monte au bûcher, susit le glaive du héros,
Ce glaive à qui son cœur demande le repos,
Ce fer à la beauté donné par le courage,
Hélas ! et dont l'amour ne présente point l'usage!"*

Hélas ! indeed we may all exclaim with Monsieur Delille, for surely no such usage was ever before made of this unfortunate instrument.

Now I am inclined to think that the origin of all these vague conjectures with regard to the sword may be traced to the word *munus*, which the commentators seem, strangely enough, to have considered alone under the limited sense of *gift*, instead of *oblation* or *offering*, which is the genuine, and, as I hope to show, the proper signification of the term in the passage above quoted. To

prove this we have only to consider the purpose for which the sword was required.

When Dido, in consequence of the treacherous conduct and meditated flight of Aeneas, had determined on her own death, she endeavoured to conceal her purpose from her sister, and had recourse to a stratagem to effect it. She pretended that the Priestess of the Massylian nation, a mighty sorceress, who was able to release souls from the power of love, had undertaken either to restore to her Aeneas's love, or to banish his image entirely from her breast. For this purpose she requested her sister to erect a funeral pile, and place upon it his *arms* which he had left in her bed-chamber, together with his *clothes* and the *nuptial bed*, as the priestess, she said, had directed her to destroy every monument of that execrable man. The stratagem succeeded, for "Anna never imagined that her sister meditated death under the pretext of these *unusual rites*."

Non tamen Anna novis pretextis finiera sacris

Germanam credit:—aut graviora timet quam morte Sichævi. lib. iv. 502.

The *arms*, *clothes*, &c. were therefore the pretended *offerings*, (*munera*) which she said she had prepared for Jupiter Stygius, in order to put a period to her miseries, and commit to the flames the Trojan pile.

Sacra Jovi Stygio, quæ rite incepta paravi,
Perficiere est animus, fineisque imponere curis
Dardanique rogum capitis permittere flammæ. v. 641.

The various preparations for the pretended sacrifice are minutely described—"Upon the bed she lays his *clothes*, the *sword he had left*, and his *image*.—Altars are also raised around, and the priestess, with hair dishevelled and a thundering voice, invokes three hundred gods, and Erebus, and Chaos, and threefold Hecate;"¹ and when every thing is prepared she contrives to dismiss Barce, the nurse of Sichæus, under the pretext of calling her sister to finish the sacrifice begun with proper rites. Then, having unsheathed the Trojan sword, an offering certainly not required (*quæsitus*) for such a purpose, she accomplishes her fatal design.

Conscendit furibunda rogos ensemble recludit
Dardanum; non hos quæsitus manus in usus.

This I take to be the true sense of the passage. Dido had deceived her sister by a mock sacrifice, for which the *arms*, *clothes*, &c. of Aeneas were originally requested as *munera* or oblations. This is shown by the sister's astonishment on discovering the fraud.

Hoc illud, germana, fuit; me fraude petebas?
Hoc rogus iste mihi, hoc ignes, aræque parabant?

The etymology of *munus* is supposed to be uncertain. It certainly approximates in sound and sense to the Hebrew מַנְעֵל an offering, from the verb מָנוּל, Arabic مُنْعَل donavit, munere donec affectit,¹ and in this sense it is almost every where used in Virgil.

A. LOCKETT.

7, Sackville Street, Nov. 27, 1815.

PRICES

Of some of the principal Books of the well-known and celebrated Library of the late RALPH WILLETT, Esq. brought from his Seat at Merly, in the County of Dorset; which was sold by Auction, by LEIGH and SOTHEBY, December 6, 1813, and 16 following days.

55 AUCTORES CLASSICI, 24 tom. uniform, Lond. Brindley, 1744, 54. --8*l.*

— Horatius, Virgilius, Terentius, et Juvenal, cum fig. 7 vol. 1. p., uniform, gilt, Lond. Sandby, 1749-63. —4*l.* 15*s.*

96 Acetini (Francisci) Oratoris praelarissimi in eloquentissimas Phalaridis tyranni epistolas per ipsum e Graeco in Latinum versas

Hoc Oposculum in Alma universitate Oronie, A Natali christiano Ducentessima et nonagesima septima Olympiade fæcileter impressum e. Hoc Theodericus rood quem collonia misit Sanguinem g'manus nobile possit opus atque sibi socius thomas fuit anglus hunte. —8*l.* 1*s.*

97 Aristidis Opera, Gr. et Lat. a S. Jebb, 2 tom. 1. p. Oxon. 1722.—9*l.*

105 Augustinus (Aur.) de Singularitate Clericorum, blue morocco, gilt, (Coloniæ) Olricus zel de Hanau, MCCCCCLXVII. [This is the second book, with a date, in which the name of Ulric Zel appears as the printer.] —4*l.* 17*s.*

106 Augustini Datti Elegantiolæ. Venet. Bapt. de Sessa, MCCCCXCII.—4*l.* 14*s.* 6*d.*

111 Æsopi Vita et Fabelæ, &c. Gr. et Lat. red morocco, gilt. Venet. ap. Ald. 1505. —14*l.*

140 Aristotelis Opera, Gr. 6 tom. with initial letters illum. Venet. Ald. MCCCCXCV.—VIII. —42*l.* 1*s.*

¹ Or perhaps from the Hebrew מַנְעֵל, Arabic مُنْعَل largitus fuit, exprobravit et benefacta. The noun is used in Arabic in the sense of a gift or divine favor.

- 141 Aristoteles, Gr. et Lat. a G. du Vallio, 4 tom. l. p. gilt. Paris, 1654. - 18*l.* 18*s.*
- 145 Atkyns', Sir R., *Glostershire*, portrait and plates, 1712. - 15*l.*
- 118 Auguste Historiae Scriptores, Ed. Prince., 2 tom. blue morocco, gilt, (first leaf reprinted) Mediol. Philip. de Lavignia, MCCCCCLXXV. - 8*l.* 15*s.*
- 152 Aulus Gellius, ex recognitione J. Andrew, et cum ejusdem pref. ad Paulum II. Ed. Prince., red morocco, gilt. Rom. in Domo Petri de Max. MCCCCCLXIX. - 12*l.*
- 153 ——— russa, ib. MCCCCCLXXII. 16*l.* 16*s.*
- 281 Bessarionis, Cardinals Sabinis, &c. adv. Calumniatores Platonis, Libri V. Ed. Prince., red morocco, gilt, initial letters illuminated. Rom. Cour. Sweynh. et Arn. Panu. MCCCCCLXIX. - 15*l.* 10*s.*
- 283 Biblia Polyglotta, studio opera et impensis Cardinalis Francisci Ximenes de Cisneros, 6 tom. gilt. Complut. de Brocario, 1514-17. 63*l.*
- 284 ——— Sacra Polyglotta, a B. Waltono, et Castelli (Edm.) Lex. cum iconibus, 8 tom. 1657-69. 53*l.* 11*s.*
- 285 ——— sacra Latina 2 tom. red moroc., gilt, Moguntie, Jo. Fust et Petrus Schoffer de Gernsheym, MCCCCCLXII. - 10*l.* (See De Bure, No. 25, page 42.)
- 286 ——— red moroc. gilt. Norimb. Antonius Coburger, MCCCCCLXXV. - 11*l.* 15*s.*
- 287 ——— printed on Vellum, with initial letters beautifully illuminated, 2 vol. bound in red moroc. gilt. Venet. Nico. Jenson, MCCCCCLXXVI. - 168*l.*
- 288 ——— Germanice, without name of printer, place, or date. - 15*l.* 15*s.*
- 296 Biblia Pauperum, sive Historiae veteris et Novi Testam- menti, figuris representatae, printed from wood-blocks, blue moroc. gilt. 25*l.* 5*s.* [This work is placed by Heineken as the *first* in the order of those books which were printed by means of wooden blocks; and a very particular description of this edition will be found in Schelhorn's Amoenitates Literariae, vol. iv. p. 293 - 300. See also the Idée Générale, &c. p. 992-300. The present is a very fine copy; each leaf, in its original form and dimensions, being inlaid; and the whole bound in blue morocco.]
- 412 Bonifacii, Papa VIII. Liber sextus decretalium, cum apparatu Joh. Andrew, printed on Vellum, red moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Pet. Schoffer, MCCCCCLXXIII. - 27*l.* 6*s.*
- 437 Britannia Illustrata, plates, 4 vol. l. p. 1700-24. - 30*l.* 9*s.*
- 445 de Bry, Collectiones Peregrinationum in Indian Orient. et Indianum Occident., XXV. partibus comprehensa; Opus illustratum, fig. aeneis fratrum de Bry et Meriani, 7 tom. blue moroc., gilt, Francof. 1590-1634. - 120*l.* Note. The above is a very fine copy of this rare Book, and is complete according to De Bure, except 10 leaves published by Merian in 1634, at the end of the first part; Part 4th the Map; Part 2d. of the 2d. Collection a Decatory Preface of John Hughes, of Lintscot; Part 3d. a Map of New Zembla; Part 9, three plates.

- 453 *Byzantinae Historiae Scriptores*, 37 tom. l. p. ruled. (*Pachymeres*, sm. pa. not ruled). Paris 1648-1755. - 47*l.* 5*s.*
- 456 *Cesaris (C. Julii) Commentariorum de Bello Gallico, Libri VII.* et de Bello Civili, Libri III. initial letters illumin. bound in Vellum, (T. Croft's Copy). Venet. Nic. Jenson, MCCCCCLXXI. - 10*l.* 10*s.*
- 457 ————— *Opera*, cum annot. S. Clarke, cum fig. second paper. Lond. 1712. - 10*l.* 10*s.*
- 554 *Ciceronis Opera*, Oliveti, 9 tom. Paris, 1740. - 23*l.* 4*s.*
- 587 *CATHOLICON* — Balbi de Balbis vel Johannis de Janua quæ vocatur *Catholicon*, Ed. Princ., yellow moroc. gilt. Mogunt. per Jo. Gutenberg, MCCCCLX. - 66*l.* 18*s.*
- 604 *CHESS* — *The Game and Plane of the Chessse, Translated out of the French, and imprinted by William Carton*, wood cuts, red moroc. gilt, no place or date, second edit. - 17*l.* 5*s.*
- 607 *Ciceronis (M. Tullii) Epist. ad M. Brutum, ad Q. Frat. ad Octavium, et ad Atticuam; ex recogn. Jo. Andreae et cum ej. epist. ad Paulum 11*, Ed. Princ., russia. Rom. Conrad Sweynh. et Arn. Paum. MCCCCLXXV. - 31*l.* 10*s.*
- 608 ————— *Epist. ad Famil.* Absque loci et Typographi indicatione, Venet. Christ. Valdarfer, MCCCCLXX. - 8*l.* 8*s.*
- 609 *Ciceronis Officia*, printed on vellum, with the initial letters illum., red moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Jo. Fust, MCCCCXLVI. - 73*l.* 10*s.*
- 610 ————— *Officia, Paradoxa et de Amicitia*. Neap. MCCCCCLXXIX. - 5*l.* 10*s.* 6*d.*
- 611 ————— *Rheticorum Libri IV.* et de Invent. Libri II. ex recens Omnipotenti Leoncini, Ed. Princ., yellow moroc. Venet. Nic. Jenson, MCCCCLXX. - 18*l.*
- 612 *The Boke of Cunte of Old Age and Friendship, &c.* russia, Emprynted by me symple Personne, William Carton, MCCCCCLXXXI. - 210*l.*
- 719 Clementis, Papa Quinti, *Constitutiones*, cum apparatu Joh. Andrae, Episcopi Aleriensis, Ed. Princ., printed on vellum, blue moroc. gilt. Mogunt. Joh. Fust et Pet. Schoffer de Gernsh. MCCCCLX. - 60*l.* 5*s.*
- 748 *Demosthenes Gr.* 2 tom. in 1, red moroc. gilt. Venet. in Ædib. Aldi. 1504. - 18*l.* 18*s.*
- 754 *Dictes and Sayengis of the Philosophers*, red morocco, gilt leaves. Reverse of last leaf, Et sic est finis. Emprynted by me William Carton, at Westmestree, the Herte of our Lord MCCCCCLXXVII. At end, A Manuscript Copp of the morale proverbes o' Christyne, Emprynted by Carton, in seuerer the colde Season, i. e. MCCCCLXXVII. - 96*l.* 10*s.*
- 806 *Erasmi Stultitiae Laus*, cum fig. Holbein. Basil. 1676. - 2*l.* 18*s.*
- 902 *ERCOLANO*. Antichità d'Ercolano da Ottav. Ant. Bayardi, con fig. 8 tom. Nap. 1757, 92. — Catal. degli Antichi Monum. di Ercol. da Ottav. Ant. Bayardo. Nap. 1754. - 59*l.* 17*s.*
- 1035 *Froissart (Jehan) Cronique*, 4 tom. en 2, red moroc. gilt and marble leaves. Lyon, 1559-61. - 1*l.* 13*s.*
- 1059 *Gower (John) Confessio Amantis* — Emprynted at West-

mestre, by me William Carton, and synysshed the 11th Day of Septembre, the first Yere of the Regne of Kyng Richard the Thyrd, the Yere of our Lord mccccxxxiii. (misprint mccccxliii.) —31*l.*

1062 Gravii, J. G. Antiquit. Rom., 12 tom.—Gronovii Jac. Antiquit. Gr., 13 tom.—Poleii, Joan. Suppleni., 5 tom.—Sallengre Alb. Hen. de Antiquit. Rom., 3 tom.—33 tom. fig., russia, l. p. Venet. 1732—7.—57*l.* 15*s.*

1124 Itinerary of John Leland the Antiquary, plates, 9 vol., l. p. Oxford, 1746—7.—57*l.* 15*s.*

1130 Gulielmi Roperi Vita D. Th. Mori, portrait, l. p. 1716.—26*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*

1162 Homeri Ilias, Gr. et Lat. a Clarke, 2 tom. 1729, 32—Homeri Odyssea, Gr. et Lat. a Clarke, 2 tom. 1740.—23*l.* 10*s.*

1179 Hamilton's, Hon. W. Etuse, Gr. and Rom. Antiquities, Fr. and English, plates, 4 vol. Naples, 1766.—46*l.* 4*s.*

1204 Homeri Opera .Gr. cum pref. Gr. Demetrii Chalcondylæ et latina Bernardi Nerbi, Ed. Princ. 2 tom. vellum, gilt. Florent. mcccclxxxviii.—88*l.* 4*s.*

1206 Homeri Opera Gr. cum Comment. Eustath. et Indice, Gr. 4 tom. in 3, red moroc., gilt. Rom. 1542—50.—58*l.* 16*s.*

1209 Horatius Flaccus, Quintus, Absque anni, loci et typographi Indicat., blue moroc. Circa. mccccxxvii.—37*l.* 16*s.* [See De Bure, No. 2711, page 312; also Santander, vol. 3, page 34.]

1210 ———— red moroc., gilt. Mediol. Ant. Zarottus, mcccclxxxiv.—18*l.* 18*s.* [This is the first edition with a date; but this copy wants the second vol., which contains the Commentaries of Aero and Porphyro.]

1211 ———— Opera, cum Comment. Christ. Landini, Ed. Princ. of the Commentary of Laudinus. Florent. Ant. Miscominus, mcccclxxxii.—6*l.* 6*s.*

1212 ———— Christophori Landini, Ed. Princ., red moroc. Florent. Ant. Miscom. mcccclxxxii.—10*l.* 15*s.*

1214 Horatii Opera, cum fig. Argent. Jo. Reinh. cognom. Gurning. mccccxcviii.—13*l.* 15*s.*

1215 Horatius. Parmæ, 1791.—6*l.* 10*s.*

1340 Johannis Sancti Evangelistæ Historia, ejusque visiones apocalypticæ, printed from wooden blocks, green moroc., gilt.—42*l.* [This edition is considered by Heineken as the *first* of those of the *Apocalypse* printed from wooden blocks; but it is doubtful whether it be not the second, or even third. Whatever be the correct date of it, the copy under description is in very fine and genuine condition in old French-green morocco binding.]

1345 Josephus, Gr. et Lat. Havercampi, 2 tom. l. p. Amst. 1726.—10*l.*

1371 Lactantii Firmiani Opera, Ed. Princ., red moroc., gilt. In Monast. Sublacensi, mcccclxv.—40*l.* 19*s.*

1469 Lucretius, Havercampi, cum fig., 2 tom. Lug. Bat. 1725.—6*l.*

1483 Livii Historia Romana, initial letters illum., russia. Mediol. Ant. Zarotus, MCCCCCLXXX.—7*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*

1493 Lucretius de Rerum Natura, red moroc., gilt. Veron. Paul. Fridenb. MCCCCCLXXXVI.—19*l.*

1646 Meninski (Franc. a Mesg.) Thes. Ling. Orient. 5 tom., russia. Vien. Aust. 1680-7.—35*l.* 14*s.*

1657 Montfaucon (Bernard de) Antiquité expliquée, avec Suppl. fig. 10 tom. in 15, l. p. ib. 1719-24.—39*l.* 18*s.*

1672 Mirrour of the Worlde or Thymage of the same, red moroc., gilt. see. ed. Carton, me fieri fecit.—136*l.* 10*s.*

1777 Orologium Sapientie. Thus endeth this present boke composed of diuerse fructfull ghostly maters of whiche the for-sende names followen to thentent that wel disposed persones that desirre to here or rede ghostly Informacons maye the sooner et knowe by this lytell Intytelyng the effectis of this sond lytell booke, in asmoche as the hole content of this lytell boke is not of one mater conlin as here after ye mane knowe.

The fyrest treatysse is named Orologium Sapientie with VII. chapitours followinge, shewyng VII. pointes of true loue of everlastingynge Wisdom.

The seconde treatysse sheweth VII. prouffytes tribulacion with VII. chapitours followinge.

The thirde treatysse sheweth the holy rule of Sapnt Benet whiche is right necessary to be knownen to al men and Wymen of Religion that understande noo laten whiche sheweth VIII. VII. pointes to be obserued.

Emprynted at Westmynstre (by William Carton) by desyryng of certeyn Worshypfull persones. See Dibdin's Ames, vol. 1st. p. 330, &c.—194*l.* 5*s.*

1781 Ovidii Opera, Burmanni, 4 tom. in 8, l. p. Amst. 1727.—2*l.* 10*s.*

1782 Ovidii Metamorphoses, Lat. et Fr. par Banier, avec tig. gravées par les soins de le Mire et Basan, 4 tom. Paris, 1767-71.—17*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*

1806 Patrick, Lowth, Whithy, and Arnald's Commentary on the Old and New Testament, 7 vol. 1744-66.—14*l.*

1810 Pausanias, Gr. gilt leaves. Venet. in Aldib. Aldi. 1516.—4*l.* 4*s.*

1823 Petrarca (Francesco) Sonetti e Triomphi Ediz. pr., ruled with red lines, russia, gilt. Venet. Vind. de Spira, MCCCCLXX. [wanting Table Alphabet. 7 leaves.]—52*l.* 10*s.*

1867 Plautus, in usum Delph. 2 tom. Paris, 1679.—4*l.* 4*s.*

1872 Plutarchi Vitæ Parallelæ, Gr. et Lat. Bryani, 5 tom. 1729.—8*l.* 15*s.*

1887 Quintiliani Opera, Burmanni, 4 tom. l. p. Lug. Bat. 1720.—7*l.* 7*s.*

1994 Pitisci (Sam.) Lexicon Antiquit. Rom. fig. 2 tom. l. p. russia. Leovard. 1713.—13*l.* 13*s.*

1996 Platonis Opera, Gr. 2 tom. red moroc. gilt. Venet. in Aldib. Aldi. 1513.—14*l.* 14*s.*

1999 *Plautus, ex recensione G. Alexandrini.* Venet. Jo. de Colou. **MCCCCCLXXII.—21*l.***

2000 *Plinii Secundi Hist. Nat.,* with initials illum., red moroc. gilt. Venet. Nic. Jenson, **MCCCCCLXXII.—10*l.* 10*s.***

2026 *Prynne's (Wm.) Records,* with frontispiece to second vol., 3 vol. russia, l.p. 1665-70—**12*l.* 2*s.*** [Note in vol. 2. Dr. Rawlinson told me there were only twenty-three copies of this volume remaining in England, the rest having been burnt with Ratcliffe's warehouses in the Fire of London, 1666. J. WEST.]

2027 *Psalmorum Codex, Latine,* printed on vellum, black moroc., gilt. Mogunt. Jo. Fust et Pet. Schoffer de Gernsh. **MCCCCLIX.—63*l.***

2030 *Ptolemai Cosmographia, ex emendatione Domitii Chalderini,* cum 16 chartis, red moroc. gilt. Rom. Arn. Buckink. **MCCCCLXXVIII.—31*l.* 10*s.***

2138 *Saona (Laurencu Guilelmu de) ordinis minorum Ethica Nova.* Impressum fuit hoc presens opus Rethorice facultatis apud villam sancti Albani, Anno domini, **MCCCCLXXX.—79*l.* 16*s.***

2156 *Quintilliani Institutiones Oratoriae,* initial letters illumin., ruled with red lines, blue moroc., gilt and marbled leaves, by Padeloup. Paris, Vascosan, **1588.—8*l.* 8*s.***

2195 *Salustio Conjuracion de Catilina y la Guerra de Jugurtha,* russia, gilt. Madrid, 1772.—**9*l.* 10*s.***

2198 Sandrart (Joach. Von) *OPERA VARIA.*—L'Academia Todesca della Archit., Scult., et Pit., Germ. 2 tom. Norimb. 1675—Ikonologia Deorum, Germ. ib. 1680—Il Giardini di Roma, ib.—Academia nobilissima Artis Pilloriae, Lat. ib. 1683—Sculpturae veteris Admiranda (with considerable number of additional plates at the end of this volume), Roma Antiquae et Novae Theatrum, ib. 1684—Insignium Roma Templorum Conspectus, ib. (with Pron's Views about Rome, and some Statutes in addition)—Romanorum Fontinilia, ib. 1685—Ovidii Metam., Germ. ib. 1698—et Biblia Icones, per Matt. Merian. The whole uniformly bound in 8 vol. red moroc. gilt.—**63*l.***

2223 *Senecæ Opera, cum not. Var.,* 3 tom. Amst. Elz. 1672.—**5*l.* 5*s.***

2306 *Bulpetti Uerulani oratoris prestantissimi opus insigne Grammaticum feliciter incipit* Lond. per Richardum Pynson, **MCCCCXCV.—42*l.***

2312 Taciti Opera, a Brotier, 4 tom. l.p. Paris, 1771.—**33*l.* 10*s.***

2322 Scheuchzeri (J. J.) *Physica Sacra,* a J. A. Pfeffel, cum 750 fig. et indice, 5 tom. Aug. Vind. 1731-5.—**26*l.***

2345 *Speculum Humanæ Salvationis,* printed from wooden blocks, cum figuris, ligno incisis, blue moroc.—**31*l.*** [Note.—This is the first edition of the Latin publication under the above name; and seems conformable to the designation of it given by Heinecken, at page 441 of his Idée Generale, &c. It is, in consequence, exceedingly curious; as presenting a specimen of a very early printed book, of which a third part is executed from blocks, both in the cuts and the type: of the remaining two third parts, the cuts are uniformly executed in wood, and the text is printed from metal types. The facsimile which Heinecken has given of the first two cuts, and of part of

the text, is very much inferior to the original : an inference, which Heinecken himself is compelled to admit.]

2346 *Speculum Humanae Salvationis*. *Belgice, cum fig. ligno incisis, red moroe.*—252*l.* [Note.—Meerman has been more fortunate in his fac-simile of the first two cuts of this impression, than Heinecken in those of the preceding one. The fac-simile of the type is, however, much inferior in strength and proportion. The cuts are all executed upon wood ; and worked off, like the previous ones, in bistre-colored ink. The type is uniformly metal, and the ink very black.]

2531 *Valerius Maximus*, red morocco. *Venet. Vind. de Spir.* MCCCCCLXXI.—16*l.* 10*s.*

2720 *MISSALE ROMANUM*, supposed to be about the 16th Century, containing 72 capital illuminations, the borders most delicately and highly finished, with grotesque figures, ornaments, flowers, fruits, insects, &c. The letters of the text highly enriched with gold.—105*l.* [N. B. This splendid Missal belonged to Mr. West.]

Literary Intelligence.

LATELY PUBLISHED.

Plotini Liber de Puleritudine. Ad codicem fidem emendavit, annotationem perpetuam, interjectis Danielis Wytténbachii notis, epistolamque ad eundem, ac preparationem cum ad hunc librum tum ad reliquos, adjecit Fredericus Creuzer. Accedunt Anecdota Græca; Proeli disputatio de Unitate et Puleritudine, Nicophori Nathanaelis Antitheticus adversus Plotinum de Anima, itemque Lectiones Platonicarum maximam partem ex codd. MSS. enotatae. *Heidelbergæ*, 1814.

The Editor has given to this obscure treatise by his preparatory dissertation as much perspicuity as ingenuity and learning could effect. To this publication is prefixed a letter to Wytténbach, in which he refutes the attacks of M. Tittman against him. But he is not satisfied with this defence ; he celebrates the domestic and learned character of M. Wytténbach's niece. We shall follow the example of the ingenious and excellent M. Millin in quoting that character :

"In omni autem genere officiorum quo me meosque obstrinxisti, ut in singulis rebus, quæ vitam honestam cultamque reddunt, egregiâ uti soles sociâ ministrâque Ianâ Gallien, nepte Tuâ, quæ parentis loco Te veneratur et adamiat. Neque enim ejus verècundiam mihi obesse committam, ne gratum certe animum eidem hâc datâ occasione profitear. Et nosti sèpiuscule necum mirari me singulare ingenium virginis, Wytténbachi. Nihil illâ modestius vidi, nul urbanius, nihil facetius eruditiusque. Nam quod aliae in mundo suo habent, anellos, myrothecia, flosculos, alia : pro his ea Homerum, Platonem, Plutarchum cum Virgilio habet. Neque tamen eadem pro fuso cala-

num, pro lanâ librum tractare solet, verum quas ipsa a negotiis statim communibusque horas eximit, eas vel commentando vel lectioni vel humanitatis sale sparsis sermonibus solet impendere. Itaque ut uxori mœi in rerum domesticarum curis suo consilio utiliter adfuit, ita in litterario genere negotiorum mihi istic officiosissima internuntia exstitit. Neque jactat sese in eis et ingenii et institutionis bonis, sed ut ceterum candidissima est et simplicissima, ita ea ipsa dissimulat et contegit. Cumque latine calleat luculenter, græcum etiam sermonem non leviter combibere cœperit, francice autem nec minus germanice ita scribat, ut ambigas utrum commodius faciat: tamen usque et usque premit quæ commentata est; neque unquam arbitror editum iri, ni Tu patriâ utaris potestate in eam, quæ filiæ pietatem Tibi præstat in aliis rebus omnibus. Insunt vero ut in ipsis moribus ac sermone, sic item in epistolis, quæ isfine missitantur, miræ quedam argutiæ ac Veneres, adjuncto candore et virginali quâdam in ipsis quoque verbis conspicuâ pudicitâ."

M. T. Ciceronis trium Orationum, pro Scauro, pro Tullio, pro Flacco, partes ineditæ cum antiquo Scholaste item inedito ad orationem pro Scauro. Inventi, recensuit, notis illustravit Angelus Majus, Biblioth. Ambros. a Ling. Orient. Mediolani, 1814.

It was usual, in the dearth of paper in the middle ages, to write across the lines of ancient MSS. The Monks of those times frequently copied the works of the Fathers and other modern writers on the fainter copies of the Classics. Over the MS. which contained the fragments brought to light by M. Majo had been written the poems of Sedulius, who lived in the 5th century. This MS. is supposed to be of the 2d or 3d century, and the new writing of the 7th or 8th. On the discovery M. Majo broke out into the following exclamation: "O Deus immortalis, quid deum video! En Ciceronem, en lumen Romanae facundiae indigissimis tenebris circumseptum!"

These fragments consist of 36 octavo pages. The most considerable is that *pro Scauro*. This is the more fortunate as very little remains of that oration. That *pro Tullio* contains eight pages. Of that *pro Flacco* little is given, but that little is useful in completing some mutilated passages.

The MS. contains likewise a fragment of the oration *pro Cœlio*, but it presents nothing new. The editor has added a descriptive dissertation and a fac-simile of a page of the MS.

A new Edition of the *Greek Testament*, in three volumes, octavo, printed from Griesbach's Text, and containing copious notes from Hardy, Raphael, Kypke, Schleusner, Rosenmüller, &c. in familiar Latin. Together with parallel passages from the Classics, and with references to Vigerus for Idioms and Bos for Ellipses.—By the Rev. Ed. Valpy, B. D. Master of Norwich School. Price 2*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.* large paper 4*l.*

Ovidii Metamorphoscæ Selectæ, et in usum Scholarum expurgatae; cum notis Anglicis. By the Rev. C. Bradley, A. M. 4*s.* 6*d.* bound.

Callimachi quæ supersunt Recensuit et cum Notarum Delectu

Edidit C. J. Blomfield, A. M. Collegii SS. Trinitatis apud Cantabrigias nuper Socius. Londini, 1815. Pr. 14s. Oct.

The Rev. Mr. Wilson has just published an expurgated Edition of *Juvenal* for Schools, with English notes.

An Enquiry into the Integrity of the Greek Vulgate, or received Text of the N. Testament. By the Rev. F. Nolan, a Presbyter of the United Church. 1815. Pr. 18s. Oct.

Miscellaneous Tracts of Professor Porson, by the Rev. T. Kidd. Pr. 14s. Oct.

In an early No. we shall present our readers with some account of this valuable work; in the mean time it may be useful to give the Table of Contents:

Imperfect outline of the Life of R. P.—Preface—Addenda—Epitaph on Alexis—Review of P. H. of V. J. of Schutz's *Eschylus*—Review of Brunck's *Aristophanes*—Review of Weston's *Hermesianax*, etc.—Review of Huntingford's Apology for the Monostrophies—The learned Pig.—Notæ breves ad Clerici et Bentlen Epistolas—Review of Robertson's Parian Chronicle—Review of Dr. Edwards's *Pseudo-Plutarch*, de Educatione Liberorum—Corrector Lectori Virgilii Londoniensis; cura Heyne—Review of Mr. R. P. Knight's analytical Essay on the Greek Alphabet—John Nic. Dawes on the *Hiatus*—Nursery Song—Supplementa ad Indicem Brunckianum in Sophoclem, ad Euripidem Beckii, ad Simplicium in Epictetum, ad Cebetis Tabula—Lacuna Lapidis Agyptiaci conjecturis suppletæ—Addenda ad Appendicem in Toupium Suidæ Kusteriani Emendatorem, ad Comicorum Græcorum Fragmenta, ad Praelectionem in Euripidem et Supplementum, ad Hecebam, ad Orestem, ad Phœnissas, ad Medeam—Ad Iliada—Ad Pseudo-Solonem—Ad Eschylum—Ad Sophoclem—Ad Euripidem—Ad Comicum incertum—Ad Theodecten—Ad Moschiona—Ad Platonem Comicum—Ad Athenæum—Ad Anaxandriden—Ad Menandrum et Philemona—Ad Theocratum—Ad Toupii Curas posteriores in Theocritu—Ad Alexandrum Etolum Parthenii—Ad Anthologiam—Ad Herodotum—Ad Thucydidem—Ad Platonem—Ad Xenophontem—Ad Theophrastum—Ad Fragmenta Pythagoreorum—Ad Aristidem—Ad Pausaniam—Ad Hephaestionem—Ad Harpoecationem—Ad J. Pollicem—Ad Hesychium—Ad Photium—Ad Suidam—Ad Etymologum Magnum—Ad Codicem Alexandrinum—Ad Codicem Cantabrigiensem—Ad Codicem Rescriptum—Ad Codicem *v* = MS. Cantab. Kk. 6. 4.—Detached Observations—Ad Eunium—Ad Terentium—Ad Cic. Tusc. Disp. Ad Livium—Ad Virgilium—Ad Horatium—Ad Juvenalem—Ad Priscianum—Ad M. A. Minetum—On Bp. Pearson—Bentleius Millio—Boyle against Bentley—R. B.'s reply to Boyle—Swift's Tale of a Tub—Lewis on Churches—Mr. Pope—On Bp. Warburton's Tracts—Ad Musgravii Dissertationes Duas—Anderson's Poets—De Obitu immaturo Raphaelis—Letter to the Rev. Dr. Davy—Appendix—Sir John Hawkins v. Dr. Johnson—Reproof valiant to Mr. Travis's Reply churlish—Errata—Addenda, Corrigenda—Auctarium—Indices.

The Section of History and Ancient Literature of the Royal Institute of France has published the two first volumes of its Memoirs.

The first volume, besides the history of the Section, and very elegant Notices on the lives and writings of Messrs. Julien le Loy, Germain Poirier, Bouchaud, Klopstok, Garnier, and Villoison; contains extracts of M. Gosselin's Researches on ancient Geography, of M. Visconti's memoir on two Greek inscriptions found at Athens, of M. Mongez' four memoirs on three inscriptions found at Lyon, and the masks of the ancients; and at full length, two capital Dissertations, titles of which are as follows: "Première mémoire sur la nature et les révolutions du droit de propriété territoriale en Egypte, depuis la conquête de ce pays par les Musulmans jusqu'à l'expédition des Français: par M. Silvestre de Sacy." "Mémoire sur le Phénix, ou recherches sur les périodes astronomiques et chronologiques des Egyptiens, par M. Larcher."

In the second volume are to be found at full length: "Mémoire sur l'origine Grecque du fondateur d'Argos, par M. Petit Radal; Mémoire sur l'Art Oratoire de Corax, par M. Garnier; Observations sur quelques ouvrages de Panétius, par le même; Mémoire sur différentes inscriptions Grecques, par M. de Villoison; Mémoire sur les monuments et les inscriptions de Kirmanschah et de Biasutoun, et sur divers autres monuments Sassanides, par M. Silvestre de Sacy; Mémoire où l'on cherche à prouver que la Harangue en réponse à la lettre de Philippe n'est pas de Démosthène, par M. Larcher; Mémoire sur la Restitution du temple de Jupiter Olympien à Agrigente, par M. Quatremere de Quincy; Doutes, conjectures, et discussions sur différents points de l'Histoire Romaine, par M. Levesque; Observations sur l'authenticité de l'origine de Rome, telle qu'elle est rapportée par Varro et par les Ecrivains Grecs et Romains, par M. Larcher; Recherches sur l'origine du Bosphore de Thrace, par M. de Choiseul-Gouffier; Mémoire sur la chronologie des Dynastes de Carie, et sur le tombeau de Mausole, par M. de Sainte Croix; Mémoire sur quelques inscriptions Arabes existant en Portugal, par M. Silvestre de Sacy; Mémoire sur les Charrues des Anciens, par M. Mongez."

Grande exécution d'Automne, No. I. WESTON.—Peking, vingtième année Kiâ-hing, huitième lune, jour malheureux—with this epigraph: Discite justitiam moniti et non temere Dicis.

The author of this little satirical pamphlet, printed in Paris by Michaud, is M. Julius Von Klaproth. His design is "de donner une critique générale de toutes les publications de M. Weston, qui fera voir clairement: 1.^o que M. Weston ne sait pas un mot de Chinois; 2.^o qu'il n'est pas en état d'écrire un seul caractère Chinois, sans le défigurer de la manière la plus barbare et le rendre tout à fait méconnaissable; 3.^o qu'il n'a pas la moindre idée de la prononciation des mots Chinois." We are told that in a future number will be examined the Chinese Lexicon of M. Deguisgnes.

Odes d'Anacréon, traduites en vers sur le texte de Brunck, par J. B. De S. Victor. Seconde Edition. From the press of P. Didot. To this very elegant translation the text and notes of Brunck are subjoined.

Professor BOISSONADE is preparing an edition of a Greek novel yet unpublished—*The Loves of Drosilla and Charicles, by Nicetas Eugenianus.*

Du Commandement de la Cavalerie et de l'Equitation : deux livres de Xénophon ; traduits par un Officier d'Artillerie à Cheval. Paris. 8vo.

This artillery officer is M. Courier, already noticed in this *Journal*, vol. viii. p. 408. He has subjoined to his French translation an accurate edition of the Greek text of Xenophon, with very learned annotations.

Ouvrages Imprimés des Membres et des Correspondans de la Classe d'Histoire et de Littérature ancienne.

Les Fontaines de Paris, anciennes et nouvelles, par M. Moisy, avec une dissertation, des descriptions historiques, et des notes critiques, par M. Amaury Duval. 1813, in fol., fig.

Mines de l'Orient, par M. de Hammer, correspondant. Vienne, 1813 et 1814, tom. iii. et deux livraisons du tom. iv. in fol., fig.

Dictionnaire de la langue Française, par M. Cattel ; édition revue par M. Champollion-Figeac, correspondant. Lyon, 1813. 8vo.

Mémoires concernant l'histoire, les sciences, les arts, les mœurs, les usages des Chinois. Tom. xvi. publié par M. le Baron Silvestre de Sacy ; (contenant la suite de la grande dynastie Tang, et un Mémoire du P. Gaubil sur la chronologie Chinoise). Paris, 1814. 4to.

M. Langlès a présenté à la Classe un exemplaire de la Chronologie Chinoise du P. Gaubil, collationné sur le manuscrit autographe.

Histoire des sectes religieuses, depuis le commencement du siècle dernier ; par M. le Comte Grégoire. Paris, 1814. 8vo. 2 vol.

Description de la Grèce, par Pausanias, traduite en Français, par M. Clavier, avec le texte Grec. Paris, 1814. tom. 1er. 8vo.

Histoire Littéraire de la France, continuée par des membres de l'Institut (MM. Brial, Pastoret, Ginguené, Daunou). Tom. xii. Paris, Firmin Didot, 1814. 4to.

Traduction en prose de l'Enéide de Virgile ; par M. Mollevault, correspondant. Seconde Edition. Paris, 1814. 8vo.

La Vie d'Agricola ; par Tacite, traduite en Italien, par M. Gaetano Marné : M. Grabert de Hemso, correspondant y a joint un Dictionnaire historique et géographique. 8vo.

Oeuvres complètes de Xénophon, traduites en Français ; avec le texte, la version latine, des notes critiques, des variantes, etc. ; par M. Gail. Tom. i. 2e. partie, et tom. vii. 2e. partie. Paris, 1814. 2 vol. 4to.

L'impression de tout l'ouvrage, en onze volumes, est terminée.

This edition of Xenophon, in Greek, Latin, and French, by so celebrated a scholar as M. GAIL, is a truly valuable work, both to his countrymen and to foreigners. It combines the advantages of—1st. An accurate text, enriched with many new readings, the result of laborious application, and of large pecuniary sacrifices. 2d. A Latin version, frequently emended. As it contains above 40 plates, we are surprised at the cheapness of the work. The price of the 10 volumes, 4to. on common paper, is 160 francs; and 320 francs on fine paper.

To those who have not subscribed by the 1st of the ensuing June, the price will be 200 francs for 160, and 400 for 320.

M. GAIL has also published in 12 vols. 4to. fine paper, with plates, price 135 francs, an edition of Thucydides in Greek, Latin, and French, with variorum readings, and historical and critical notes. The edition in Greek and Latin, with notes and variorum readings, may be had separately from the French translation; price 110 francs in 10 vols. or 60 francs on common paper.

Isocratis oratio de permutatione, cuius pars ingens primūm græcè edita ab Andreā Mustoxidi (corresp.) nunc primūm latīnè exhibetur ab anonymo interprete qui et notas et appendices adjunxit. Mediolani, 1813. 8vo.

PREPARING FOR PUBLICATION.

The First Number of the new and improved edition of *Stephens' Greek Thesaurus* will be ready for delivery in a very few days—The copies of deceased Subscribers are for sale till the 1st of March, after which the price will be raised from time to time according to circumstances. A detail of the general plan which is meant to be followed in the work may be had on application, or by letter [post paid], at No. 21 Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane, London. It is respectfully requested that such Subscribers as have not yet sent any reference in London, will as early as convenient favor Mr. A. J. Valpy with the name of some friend, or an order through a Bookseller, who may be authorised to receive the numbers and pay the Subscription.

Ites. Erasmi Rot. Concio de Pvero Iesv olim pronvnciata a pvero in Schola Iohannis Coleti Londini Institvta in qva præsidebat Imago Pveri Iesv Docentis Specie. Editio Nova. The text will be taken from the latest Frobenian editions (viz. that annexed to Erasmi Enchiridion Militis Christiani, Bas. 1540, 8vo. and that in Erasmi Opera Omnia, Bas. 1540, folio,) which was adopted by Le Clerc, in Erasmi Opera Omnia, Luggd. Bat. 1704, folio. These editions have been collated with two others of earlier date (annexed to the Enchiridion Militis Christiani, Bas. apud Froben. 1519, 8vo. and Colon. apud Cervicorn. 1519. 4to.); and the principal Variations will be noticed at the foot of the page. The marginal notes of the early editions will be retained.

The edition now preparing will be uniform in size with the large paper copies of "Preces, Catechismus, et Hymni, in usum Scholae Paulinae, MDCCCXIV;" and One Hundred Copies only will be printed for sale.

Two Greek and English Lexicons are preparing, Mr. Jones's and Mr. E. V. Blomfield's. The former was announced some years ago, in the First Edition of the author's Greek Grammar; the latter is a translation of Schneider's Greek and German Lexicon, with several valuable improvements and additions.

An English translation of Matthæi's Greek Grammar in German, is preparing for publication. We cannot but express our wish that the same honor were intended for Buttman's.

We hear that Mr. Gifford is on the point of publishing an English poetical version of *Persius*, to match his *Juvenal*.

NOTES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

OUR correspondents will see by the size of this No., that we have not been so attentive to our pecuniary interest, as to the gratification of inserting their articles. Many are still delayed, but none neglected.

The scale of the merit of ancient poets would have been more just, if it had been drawn up by E. O. B. himself.

We wish that *nostri farrago libelli* should be as comprehensive as possible; but we cannot insert L. B.'s dissertation. Had it been more critical and less polemical, it would have been more adapted to our *Classical* and *Biblical* readers.

In our next No. we shall present to our readers a fac-simile of the *Elean Inscription*; accompanied by an illustrative commentary.

Abbé Morso's Arabic Chart is again postponed for particular reasons. The correspondent, who wrote on the subject of it some time ago, may be satisfied by calling on the Printer of this *Journal*.

To the advice relative to *Scarce Tracts*, our Constant Reader will find more than one on an average in each No. We shall certainly record one at least in all future Nos.

Obss. on the 24th Book of the *Odyssey* came too late for our present No. It shall appear in the next, with any other articles of geniusous author may wish to appear in our pages.

P. R.'s Reply to Sir W. D. will have an early insertion.

L.'s Critique on Ossian's Temera has been received.

We are greatly obliged for the loan of W. Burton's Tracts.

Mr. S.'s *Coincidence of Passages in Ancient and Modern Authors* shall appear in our next.

The *Essay on Triposes*, with the *Tripos and Commentary*, came too late for our present No.

In our next, we shall give some account of two works published at St. Petersburgh, a few months ago—one is the "*Dissertation sur le Monument de la Reine Comosarie*," and the other M. Ouvaroff's learned "*Essai sur les Mystères d'Elenusis*." Second Edition.

We shall also offer some remarks on Mr. Atkinson's "*Sohrāb*, an Episode extracted from the *Shahnamah*, of Firdūsi, the celebrated Persian Poet, and translated into Verse.

ERRATA.

No.	p.	t.
XXII	293 24	for Icthi read Tati.
	306 28	— principes — principis.
XXIII	208 2	vindicat
	211 17	Dt.

*• The Index to Vols. XI. and XII. will be given in No. XXV.

NO. XXIV.

Cl. Jl.

VOL. XII.

2 K

**PROPOSALS
FOR PUBLISHING BY SUBSCRIPTION,**

IN TWO VOLUMES ROYAL QUARTO,

[Uniformly with Mr. TAYLOR's Translations of Aristotle and Plato.]

A TRANSLATION

OF THE SIX BOOKS OF PROCLUS,

On the Theology of Plato;

TO WHICH, A

SEVENTH BOOK

Will be added, in order to supply the deficiency of another Book on this subject, which was written by PROCLUS, but since lost;

ALSO A TRANSLATION OF

PROCLUS' ELEMENTS OF THEOLOGY.

BY THOMAS TAYLOR.

In these Volumes will also be included, by the Same,

A TRANSLATION OF THE TREATISE OF PROCLUS

On Providence and Fate;

A TRANSLATION OF EXTRACTS FROM HIS TREATISE
ENTITLED,

Ten Doubts concerning Providence;

AND,
A TRANSLATION OF EXTRACTS FROM HIS TREATISE

On the Subsistence of Evil;

AS PRESERVED IN THE BIBLIOTHECA GR. OF FABRICIUS.

—
250 COPIES ONLY WILL BE PRINTED.

Price to Subscribers 5*l.* 5*s.* — To Nonsubscribers 6*l.* 6*s.*

Subscribers Names will be received by Mr. VALPY, 21. Tooke's Court, Chancery Lane, London, for the AUTHOR, who respectfully requests that a reference in Town, where the work can be delivered, and the amount received, may accompany the favor of the Subscription.

* * The work is in the Press. The Subscription will close on the day of Publication.

|